Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

EXTEND THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964
AND
AMEND THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

PLEASE RETURN TO USDA
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY
LAW BRANCH, LEGISLATIVE REPORT
Rm. 117-E, Admin Bldg.
Wash. D. C. Ext. 4654

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETIETH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 1268, H.R. 1269, H.R. 1318, H.R. 3817, and H.R. 7105

MARCH 15 AND 16, 1967

Serial D

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
77-523 WASHINGTON : 1967

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas,
Vice Chairman
JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi
WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia
PAUL C. JONES, Missouri
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky
GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas
MASTON O'NEAL, Georgia
THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington
JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, New York
ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, Texas
JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
JOHN G. DOW, New York
BILL NICHOLS, Alabama
G. V. MONTGOMERY, Mississippi
FRANK J. BRASCO, New York
W. S. STUCKEY, Georgia
JOHN R. RARICK, Louisiana

PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma,
Ranking Minority Member
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California
CATHERINE MAY, Washington
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
GEORGE V. HANSEN, Idaho
WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia
GEORGE A. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
CLARENCE E. MILLER, Ohio
J. HERBERT BURKE, Florida
ROBERT B. MATHIAS, California
WILEY MAYNE, Iowa
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
THOMAS S. KLEPPE, North Dakota
ROBERT PRICE, Texas
JOHN T. MYERS, Indiana

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER
SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, Puerto Rico

CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER, *Clerk*
HYDE H. MURRAY, *Assistant Counsel*
FRANCIS M. LEMAY, *Staff Consultant*

CONTENTS

Page

H.R. 1268, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to permit the distribution of federally owned foods and food coupons in areas in which the food stamp program is operating 1
H.R. 1269, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to permit the distribution of federally owned foods and food coupons in areas in which the food stamp program is operating 2
H.R. 1318, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967 2
H.R. 3817, a bill to authorize certain retired persons 65 years of age or over to participate in the food stamp and direct distribution programs 2
H.R. 7105, a bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to strengthen and expand food service programs for children 2
Statement of:
Freeman, Hon. Orville L., Secretary of Agriculture 7
Graham, Harry L., legislative representative, the National Grange 103
Healy, Patrick B., assistant secretary, National Milk Producers Federation 61
Johnson, Reuben L., director of legislative services, National Farmers Union 113
Mitchell, Clarence, director, Washington bureau, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People 114
Saylor, Hon. John P., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania 111
Sisk, Hon. B. F., a Representative in Congress from the State of California 87
Slack, Hon. John M., a Representative in Congress from the State of West Virginia 112
Sullivan, Hon. Leonor K., a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri 75
Vigorito, Hon. Joseph P., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania 96
Wiley, George A., director, Poverty Rights Action Center 63
Correspondence submitted to the committee:
Clegg, Reed K., director, Department of Public Welfare, County of Fresno, Calif., letter of March 7, 1967, to Hon. B. F. Sisk 88
Freeman, Hon. Orville L., Secretary of Agriculture, letter of February 20, 1967, to Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, transmitting amendment to Child Nutrition Act of 1966 4
Freeman, Hon. Orville L., Secretary of Agriculture, letter of March 2, 1967, to Hon. John W. McCormack, transmitting amendments to the Food Stamp Act of 1964 6
McCanna, Dr. Henry A., National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., letter of March 21, 1967 115
Rosen, Max, secretary, Department of Public Welfare, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, letter of June 23, 1966, to Hon. Joseph P. Vigorito 102
Tom C. Allen, president, National Association of Wheat Growers, letter of March 17, 1967 115
Additional information submitted to the committee:
Administrative costs, Federal, State, and local, food stamp program 34
Commodity distribution program for needy families, areas operating 52
Council of the City of Erie, Pa., resolution 100
Eligibility standards for nonassistance households, food stamp program (table) 31

Additional information submitted to the committee—Continued
General Assembly of Pennsylvania: Page
House Resolution No. 74 99
House Resolution No. 75 100
Guidelines for determining eligibility of households as contained in sec. 1601.3 of the regulations for the food stamp program 30
Participation and coupon value, by project area, food stamp program (table) 14
Retired Need Help—From the Erie Churchman, July 1966 101
Summary of breakfast programs operating under provisions of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (table) 39

EXTEND THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964 AND AMEND THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 1967

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Abbitt, Jones of Missouri, Stubblefield, O'Neal, de la Garza, Vigorito, Jones of North Carolina, Dow, Nichols, Montgomery, Brasco, Rarick, Belcher, Teague, Mrs. May, Dole, Hansen, Wampler, Goodling, Miller, Burke, Mathias, Mayne, Zwach, Kleppe, and Myers.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, clerk; Hyde H. Murray, assistant counsel; Francis LeMay, staff consultant; and Fowler C. West, assistant staff consultant.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

The committee is met this morning to consider two pieces of legislation which are not directly related but related to the same subject matter, and we thought we would move along a little faster by using only one hearing, rather than calling all these people in here to appear two separate times.

The Secretary is here today. We thought, by consolidating both the extension of the food stamp program and the Child Nutrition Act for hearing, we would save him and his associates being required to spend another day in appearing before the committee and also save the time of the members of the committee.

We will, therefore, proceed on these subjects, and will at this time hear from Secretary Freeman on both the food stamp program and the Child Nutrition Act.

There will be placed in the record at this time H.R. 7105, dealing with the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, and H.R. 3817 and H.R. 1318 and H.R. 1269 and H.R. 1268, dealing with the Food Stamp Act of 1964, together with the reports from the Department of Agriculture dated February 20, 1967, and March 2, 1967, which will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The bills, H.R. 1268 by Mr. Sisk, H.R. 1269 by Mr. Sisk, H.R. 1318 by Mrs. Sullivan, H.R. 3817 by Mr. Vigorito, and H.R. 7105 by Mr. Poage, and the departmental reports follow:)

[H.R. 1268, 90th Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to permit the distribution of federally owned foods and food coupons in areas in which the food stamp program is operating

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 4 of the Food

Stamp Act of 1964 is hereby repealed and subsection (c) of that section is redesignated as subsection (b).

[H.R. 1269, 90th Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to permit the distribution of federally owned foods and food coupons in areas in which the food stamp program is operating

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(b) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In areas where a food stamp program is in effect there shall be no distribution of federally owned foods to households under the authority of any other law except during emergency situations caused by national or other disaster as determined by the Secretary: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary may authorize, on such terms and conditions as he determines appropriate, distribution of federally owned foods in such areas to households of seasonal or migratory workers who are otherwise eligible to receive benefits under this Act but who are not receiving such benefits because of the transitory nature of their employment, if the Secretary determines that such distribution of federally owned foods to such households is necessary to effectuate the policy expressed in section 2 of this Act."

[H.R. 1318, 90th Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year" and substituting therefor "and for each subsequent fiscal year such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

[H.R. 3817, 90th Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To authorize certain retired persons sixty-five years of age or over to participate in the food stamp and direct distribution programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. The Secretary of Agriculture may distribute to persons who are sixty-five years of age, or over, and who are retired from any gainful employment, without reference to their personal need or income, dairy products made available for distribution pursuant to section 709 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, and surplus food commodities made available for distribution to needy persons under clause (2) of section 32, Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, or clause (3) of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 5(a) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)) is amended (1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "Participation in the food stamp program shall be limited to" and (2) by inserting "and (2) those households having one member over the age of sixty-four years who is retired from any gainful employment and whose income does not exceed $3,000 a year, or two or more members over the age of sixty-four years who are retired from any gainful employment and whose combined income does not exceed $4,000 a year" immediately before the period at the end thereof.

[H.R. 7105, 90th Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to strengthen and expand food service programs for children

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by adding at the end of the Act the following new sections:

"SPECIAL FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

"AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 17. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as are necessary to enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out a pilot program to assist States through grants-in-aid and other means, to initiate, maintain, or expand nonprofit food service programs for children in public and private nonprofit institutions such as child day-care centers, settlement houses, recreation centers, and similar institutions, which provide day care for children, and which draw attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist. In selecting the nonprofit institutions, the State education agency shall, to the extent practicable, give first consideration to those institutions drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist.

"APPORTIONMENT TO STATES

"(b) (1) Of the funds appropriated for the purposes of this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall: (1) reserve 2 per centum for apportionment to Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. Such funds shall be apportioned among them on the basis of the number of children of ages three through seventeen in each to the number of all children of ages three through seventeen in all of them.

"(2) Of the remainder of the funds appropriated, the Secretary shall, for each fiscal year (a) apportion such sums as he deems appropriate but not more than $50,000 to each State, other than Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, as a basic grant, and (b) apportion the remainder among such States on the basis of the ratio of the number of children in each State of ages three through seventeen in families with incomes of less than $3,000 per annum to the total number of such children in the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

"DISBURSEMENT BY STATES

"(c) Funds apportioned and paid to any State for the purpose of this section shall be disbursed by the State educational agency to nonprofit institutions selected on a nondiscriminatory basis by the State educational agency to reimburse such nonprofit institutions for the cost of obtaining agricultural and other foods and for the purposes of items (1) and (2) of this subsection. The costs of obtaining agricultural and other foods may include the cost of processing, distributing, transporting, or handling thereof. Disbursement to participating institutions shall be made at such rates of reimbursement per meal as the Secretary shall prescribe.

"(1) In circumstances of severe need where the rate per meal established by the Secretary is insufficient to carry on an effective feeding program, the Secretary may authorize financial assistance not to exceed 80 per centum of the operating costs of such a program, including cost of obtaining, preparing, and serving food.

"(2) Not to exceed 25 per centum of the funds paid to any State may be used by the State to assist nonprofit institutions serving needy children by paying not to exceed 75 per centum of the cost of the purchase of rental or equipment, other than land and buildings, for the storage, preparation, transportation, and serving of food to enable such institutions to establish, maintain, and expand food service under this section.

"DIRECT PAYMENTS

"(d) The withholding of funds and their disbursement to public and private nonprofit institutions shall be carried out by the Secretary under circumstances comparable to those provided for in section 10 of the National School Act, as amended.

"OBLIGATION OF FUNDS

"(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, balances of funds appropriated for the purposes of this section and unobligated at the end of any fiscal year shall remain available for obligation during the first three months of the following fiscal year.

"NUTRITIONAL AND OTHER PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

"(f) Nonprofit institutions to which funds are disbursed under this section shall serve meals consisting of a combination of foods and meeting minimum nutritional standards prescribed by the Secretary on the basis of tested nutritional research. Such meals shall be served without cost or at a reduced cost to children determined by such institutions to be unable to pay the full cost. In making such determination, institutional authorities should, to the extent practicable, consult with public welfare and health agencies. No physical segregation or other discrimination against any child shall be made because of his inability to pay.

"NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

"(g) 'Nonprofit institution' means any public or private institution, except a school or other educational institution of higher learning, which provides for the care and training of children and no part of the earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or institution.

"SPECIAL PROVISIONS

"(h) The provisions of sections 6, 7, 8, 11, and 13 of this Act, notwithstanding their limitation of applicability to operations under other programs of this Act, shall also be applicable to the program operated under this section.

"FURTHER APPORTIONMENTS

"SEC. 18. If any State cannot utilize all funds apportioned to it, or if additional funds are made available for apportionment among the States, under any section of this Act, the Secretary shall make further apportionments to the remaining States in the manner prescribed in the applicable section."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1967.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I transmit herewith an amendment to the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, authorizing assistance to the States in initiating and expanding food service programs to improve the nutrition of children in non-residential group situations other than schools.

Great concern has been expressed by Members of Congress and those interested in good nutrition for children that there remains one major gap in the legislative framework provided by the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts. The authority provided in these Acts permits assistance only to children enrolled in school activities. The full range of Federal assistance cannot be made available to children in public or private nonprofit day-care centers, settlement houses or nonprofit pre-school activities. Many of these are among our neediest children in terms of nutrition and the lack of adequate family income to provide good nutrition.

It is vital to the health and vitality of these children that provision be made—particularly in the pre-school years—to improve the quality of their diets. Dietary deficiencies in early childhood can result in damage to the child's health and learning capacity before he reaches school.

In addition, there are hundreds of thousands of children who benefit from the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act programs during the school year but who have no access to these programs during the summer months unless they are actually enrolled in a summer school. The proposed amendment to the Child Nutrition Act would authorize food service programs during the summer months to children engaged in such group activities as summer recreational programs, day camps, and youth centers.

The amendment transmitted herewith will provide:

(1) A program to assist in providing a food service for children participating in group situations away from home such as child day-care centers, settlement houses and day camps as long as these are non-residential types of situations. Assistance will be directed primarily to those serving children of low-income families although where a program is in effect, all children may participate.

(2) In circumstances of severe need, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to pay not to exceed 80 percent of all operating costs of the food program.

(3) Not to exceed 25 percent of the funds paid to any State may be used to assist eligible nonprofit institutions in the purchase or rental of facilities, other than land and buildings, for the storage, preparation, transportation and serving of food.

(4) The food service programs proposed under this amendment will be administered by the State educational agency which now administers the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts.

It is contemplated that the program would be operated initially on a pilot basis reaching approximately 100,000 children the first year at a cost of $4.5 million. The majority of these children will probably participate during the summer months.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

A BILL To amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to strengthen and expand food service programs for children

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by adding at the end of the Act the following new sections:

"SPECIAL FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

"AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 17(a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as are necessary to enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out a pilot program to assist States through grants-in-aid and other means, to initiate, maintain or expand nonprofit food service programs for children in public and private nonprofit institutions such as child day-care centers, settlement houses, recreation centers and similar institutions, which provide day care for children, and which draw attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist. In selecting the nonprofit institutions, the State education agency shall, to the extent practicable, give first consideration to those institutions drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist.

"APPORTIONMENT TO STATES

"(b)(1) Of the funds appropriated for the purposes of this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall: (1) reserve 3 per centum for apportionment to Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. Such funds shall be apportioned among them on the basis of the number of children of ages three through seventeen in each to the number of all children of ages three through seventeen in all of them.

"(2) Of the remainder of the funds appropriated, the Secretary shall, for each fiscal year (a) apportion such sums as he deems appropriate but not more than $50,000 to each State, other than Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, as a basic grant, and (b) apportion the remainder among such States on the basis of the ratio of the number of children in each State of ages three through seventeen in families with incomes of less than $3,000 per annum to the total number of such children in the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

"DISBURSEMENT BY STATES

"(c) Funds apportioned and paid to any State for the purpose of this section shall be disbursed by the State educational agency to nonprofit institutions selected by the State educational agency to reimburse such nonprofit institutions for the cost of obtaining agricultural and other foods and for the purposes of items (1) and (2) of this sub-section. The costs of obtaining agricultural and other foods may include the cost of processing, distributing, transporting or handling thereof. Disbursement to participating institutions shall be made at such rates of reimbursement per meal or on such other basis as the Secretary shall prescribe.

"(1) In circumstances of severe need where the rate per meal established by the Secretary is insufficient to carry on an effective feeding program, the Secretary may authorize financial assistance not to exceed 80 per centum of the operating costs of such a program, including cost of obtaining, preparing, and serving food.

"(2) Not to exceed 25 per centum of the funds paid to any State may be used by the State to assist nonprofit institutions serving needy children in the purchase or rental of facilities, other than land and buildings, for the storage, preparation, transportation, and serving of food to enable such institutions to establish, maintain, and expand food service under this section.

"DIRECT PAYMENTS

"(d) If in any State the State educational agency is not permitted by law or is otherwise unable to disburse the funds paid to it under this section to any nonprofit institution in the State, the Secretary shall withhold all funds apportioned under this section and shall disburse the funds so withheld directly to nonprofit institutions in the State for the same purposes and subject to the same conditions as are required of a State educational agency disbursing funds made available under this section.

"OBLIGATION OF FUNDS

"(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, balances of funds appropriated for the purposes of this section and unobligated at the end of any fiscal year shall remain available for obligation during the first three months of the following fiscal year.

"NUTRITIONAL AND OTHER PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

"(f) Nonprofit institutions to which funds are disbursed under this section shall serve meals consisting of a combination of foods and meeting minimum nutritional standards prescribed by the Secretary on the basis of tested nutritional research. Such meals shall be served without cost or at a reduced cost to children determined by such institutions to be unable to pay the full cost. In making such determination, institutional authorities should, to the extent practicable, consult with public welfare and health agencies. No physical segregation or other discrimination against any child shall be made because of his inability to pay.

"NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

"(g) 'Nonprofit institution' means any public or private institution, except a school or other educational institution of higher learning, which provides for the care and training of children and no part of the earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or institution.

"SPECIAL PROVISIONS

"(h) The provisions of sections 6, 7, 8, 11 and 13 of this Act, notwithstanding their limitation of applicability to operations under other programs of this Act, shall also be applicable to the program operated under this section.

"FURTHER APPORTIONMENTS

"SEC. 18. If any State cannot utilize all funds apportioned to it, or if additional funds are made available for apportionment among the States, under any section of this Act, the Secretary shall make further apportionments to the remaining States in the manner prescribed in the applicable section."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, P.L. 88–525.

This bill would amend Section 16 of the Food Stamp Act. It would provide appropriation authority for fiscal years beyond 1967. No other change in the

substantive legislative authorities for the Food Stamp Program is deemed necessary at this time.

P.L. 88–525, approved by the President on August 31, 1964, contemplated the progressive expansion of the program—over the period of the next several years—to those States and political subdivisions that desired to participate. That Act, however, provided appropriation authorities only through the fiscal year 1967. It is necessary, therefore, that Section 16 of the Act be amended to provide appropriation authorities to implement that policy of orderly and progressive program expansion.

When the Food Stamp Act was approved, the program was then operating in 43 areas—in 22 States—in which the food stamp approach had been carefully tested during a 3-year "pilot" period. Since then, the pace of the authorized expansion has, in fact, not kept pace with requests from States for the program. Nonetheless, by the end of the 1967 fiscal year, the program will be operating in about 800 areas in 41 States and the District of Columbia.

In requesting appropriation authority beyond 1967, it is contemplated that the policy of orderly and progressive year-to-year expansion would be continued. Such a policy would continue to permit State welfare agencies and this Department to provide the administrative organization and program supervision that is needed to insure the effective and efficient use of Federal funds in support of program objectives.

Action to assure States that the program will be continued beyond June 30, 1967, should be taken at the earliest possible date. If the future of the program for the next fiscal year remains in doubt, States will hesitate to complete 1967 fiscal year expansion plans—much less undertake the longer range plans to build the administrative organization needed to adequately supervise already operating programs.

The actual level of the annual appropriation for each fiscal year beyond 1967 would be determined by the Congress under the annual appropriation process. Additionally, because the proposed bill is concerned only with the continuation of appropriation authorities, it would not affect program cost or employment requirements for the program.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the presentation of this report is consistent with the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

By Orville L. Freeman, *Secretary.*

A BILL To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year" and substituting therefor "and for each subsequent fiscal year such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The Chairman. We will be delighted to hear from you, Mr. Secretary.

STATEMENT OF HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY HOWARD DAVIS, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, CONSUMER FOOD PROGRAMS, CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE, AND ISABELLE KELLEY, DIRECTOR, FOOD STAMP DIVISION, CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Secretary Freeman. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, may the record show that in addition to Mr. Davis, who is here with me, that Miss Kelley, who is directly administering this program, is also here this morning, to assist the committee and the Secretary in answering questions.

I am happy to appear here to discuss two proposals related to the food stamp and the child nutrition programs now pending before this committee.

It is appropriate that they be considered together because each represents a facet of the efforts this committee has long made to improve nutrition in this country and to strengthen our domestic agriculture. The Food Stamp Act—which we propose be authorized now as a permanent program—is designed to improve nutrition for the family at home; the proposed amendment to the Child Nutrition Act would fill a gap which now exists in providing food service for needy children in group activities away from home.

This committee has done a remarkable pioneering job in the evolution of our thinking and programing to assure all Americans of physical and financial access to good nutrition. Let's look at the record:

In 1946, the National School Lunch Act; in 1954, the special milk program; in 1964, the Food Stamp Act; and in 1966, the Child Nutrition Act.

This is a solid, substantial record of which this committee can be proud.

I would like first to discuss the proposal to extend the authority for the appropriation of funds for the food stamp program. That is the essence of the matter before the committee in this respect; no modification of the program is recommended except an extension of the authorization to continue to carry it forward. In so doing, I want to report to this committee on the progress of the program since August of 1964 when the Food Stamp Act was passed.

You will recall that the 1964 food stamp legislation provided authority for appropriations only through the fiscal year 1967. H.R. 1318 amends section 16 of the act to provide authority for the Congress to appropriate funds for the program for 1968 and subsequent fiscal years. Thus, prompt action is necessary—if the program is to be continued beyond June of this year.

Mr. Chairman, as you and a number of the members of the committee recall, a careful 3-year test of the food stamp program was undertaken by the Department prior to the passage of the Food Stamp Act. At the time the act was passed, this test, or pilot, program was operating in 43 areas in 22 States.

The test was designed to determine the effectiveness of the food stamp approach in improving the nutrition of low-income families. The test did demonstrate the effectiveness of the food stamp approach: (1) in improving the diets of low-income families; (2) in increasing retail food sales; (3) expanding farm markets, and (4) in stimulating the economy of the communities in which its operates.

We believe that the continued effectiveness of the food stamp program stems from four basic principles underlying the Food Stamp Act. These are:

First, the program is a voluntary one on the part of the States and localities. This means that, when requesting the program, the States and localities believe the program will meet their needs and, therefore, are prepared to give the program the financial and other support the program must have if it is to be successful.

Second, its expansion has followed the gradual progressive pace contemplated by the Congress. This concept of progressive annual expansion has meant that both the Department and cooperating State welfare agencies have had time to gain the experience and build the kind of administrative organization that is essential to effective and prudent program administration.

Third, the Department has continued to exercise close supervision and direction—an element that our pilot experience convinced us was essential to the success of the program.

Fourth, the design of the program assures that the Federal assistance provided to participating families is used to buy more and better food. It also assures that the program will not be used as a substitute for State and local responsibilities for general welfare programs for the poor.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to expand upon this fourth principle—because it goes to the heart of the food stamp program.

For the average American family, food is a bargain—with that family spending less than 20 percent of its income for food. But, low-income families spend a much larger percentage of their income for food—many in excess of 50 percent of their income. Yet, poor families cannot afford all the food they need for good health. They need more fruits and vegetables and more livestock products, for example. And this latter need, of course, means that these families could utilize more grain products—in the form of meat, milk and other dairy products, and poultry.

The food stamp program is designed to overcome the financial limitations to better diets on the part of our low-income families. Under it, eligible families exchange the amount of money they would normally spend for food for an allotment of food coupons worth more. They then use the coupons, as they would use cash, to buy more and better food at local grocery stores.

Food stamp families cannot purchase (1) tobacco or (2) alcoholic beverages with the food coupons. And, coupons cannot be used for (3) any imported foods that retain their identity as an imported food in the retail food store.

We refer to the sums the participating families invest in the program as the coupon purchase requirement. It represents the amounts of money eligible families would have spent for food in the absence of the food stamp program.

On the average, the family's investment in the program represents about 64 percent of the total value of the coupons they receive each month. The value of the coupons they receive free averages about $6 per person per month. But this ratio would vary for each individual family. The very poorest families would, for example, invest about $2 per person per month. In return, they would receive about $10 worth of coupons a month for each member of the family.

Because of the coupon purchase requirement, food stamp families are required to continue to spend a substantial percentage of their income for food. The program will not permit them to divert some of their food dollars to meet their nonfood needs that may be equally pressing needs. Other approaches and other programs must be used to help the low-income families with these other needs. The stamp program only helps them to buy more and better food.

Quite frankly, the acceptance of the food stamp program by the State and localities has exceeded the optimistic expectations we had at the time the Food Stamp Act was passed. We then felt that, based upon our experience under the direct donation program for needy families, about 50 percent of the some 3,000 counties in the country would eventually want to participate in the program. But, we are finding that many localities that previously did not request to participate in direct distribution have asked to be included in the food stamp program. Of the some 870 areas the States have now scheduled to be operating stamp programs by the end of this fiscal year, 249, or 29 percent, were not previously participating in the commodity distribution program.

Mr. Chairman, there is attached to my statement a table which shows the progress we have made under the food stamp program since the act was signed in August of 1964. I am also submitting for the record, program data for each of the 589 project areas that were in operation in January 1967:

When the act was passed in August 1964, about 351,000 persons were participating in the 43 pilot areas located in 22 States.

In January of this year, the program was operating in 589 areas in 41 States and the District of Columbia, with 1.4 million participants.

By the end of this fiscal year, the States are now scheduled to open 286 additional areas. If the States adhere to their schedules, by the end of June the program will be operating in 875 areas, with about 2 million participants. One additional State, Massachusetts, is scheduled to open its first project by the end of the fiscal year.

And it gives me a very warm personal feeling, if you will pardon the personal reference, to make this report on the success and the expansion of this program, because it is another evidence of how, working together, we have been able to make available America's food abundance not just to thousands but to millions of needy Americans. One of the reasons why I came to Washington to be Secretary of Agriculture was because I thought that was one of the most important things that we could do for this Nation, and it does give me a warm feeling to come here this morning to make this report, to show that 2 million families will have their diets very significantly supplemented and that we will make it possible for them to enjoy the abundance of the great agriculture of this great Nation which enables us to do this.

I believe the committee would be interested in knowing something about the general characteristics of these 875 areas.

About 40 percent of the population of the country, based upon 1960 census data, reside in these 875 areas.

Six hundred and nine of these areas, 70 percent, had more than half of their population classified as rural people under the 1960 census.

A total of 116 of these areas are included in the list of the 300 poorest counties in the country, as measured by the per capita income of the county.

About 2.5 percent of the total population of these areas will participate in the food stamp program. But in some of the lowest income counties, up to 25 percent of the county's population was benefiting from the food stamp program in January of this year.

H.R. 1318 will authorize the continuation of the program beyond June of this year by providing appropriation authorities for fiscal year 1968 and later years. With this amendment, we would plan to continue to progressively expand the program to all areas within the country that request to participate.

I might, at this point, briefly touch on the division of administrative authorities under the Food Stamp Act. The States, acting through the State agency which administers the federally aided public assistance programs, is responsible for the certification of applicant households and for the sale and issuance of the food coupons. The Department of Agriculture, through our Consumer and Marketing Service, is directly responsible for the supervision of participating retailers and wholesalers.

The State welfare agency, through its local counterpart offices, must assume responsibility for the certification of households. The act requires that these certification functions be carried out under the same general procedures and merit-system personnel standards used in the certification of recipients of public assistance.

More flexibility is provided to the State welfare agency in connection with the sale of the food coupons. It may elect to sell the coupons through its own local offices; it may delegate this responsibility to the local government; or it may hire banks to sell the coupons. In each case, however, the sales function must be carried out in accordance with the careful accountability controls that have been established by our Consumer and Marketing Service.

In connection with the participation of retailers and wholesalers, we follow the principle of voluntary participation. But, we do find that virtually all retailers elect to participate. In January of this year, a total of 51,900 retail food stores were authorized to accept food coupons.

We have received the finest cooperation from food retailers and wholesalers. And, they have been high in their praise of the program and its lack of complications. More importantly, retailer compliance with the restrictions on the acceptance of the coupons has been at a very satisfactory level.

Where we do find a retailer has willfully disregarded program regulations, we use the authorities in the act to disqualify the store. Since the act was passed in 1964, we have found it necessary to disqualify only 57 stores, for periods ranging from 30 days to 1 year. Another 189 firms received an official warning letter because of the minor nature of the violations. Another 239 stores, for which an investigation was undertaken because there was evidence that indicated possible violations, were found to be free of violations.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we wish to acknowledge the excellent cooperations of the commercial banking system. Retailers and wholesalers redeem the coupons they accept from the families at commercial banks in their own community. The commercial banks receive no payment from the Federal Government for this service.

We believe the principles and operating guidelines the Congress incorporated into the Food Stamp Act of 1964 have stood the test of time. Further, we believe the Congress also provided sufficient flexibility, within those program principles and guidelines, for the De-

partment to develop the detailed operating procedures. This flexibility permits us to adjust program specifics as State and local conditions warrant. Therefore, the Department recommends that the Food Stamp Act continue without change, except for the extension of appropriation authorities.

When the President approved the Food Stamp Act in 1964, he said, in part:

> I believe the Food Stamp Act weds the best of the humanitarian instincts of the American people with the best of the free enterprise system.

He went on to say that he felt the act was a realistic and responsible step forward toward the fuller and wiser use of agricultural abundance.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the program has lived up to these expectations. And, I believe a solid base has been laid for further progress in the immediate years ahead.

Now, I would like to turn to a discussion of the proposed amendment to the Child Nutrition Act also under consideration today. We need this legislation to round out our capability of improving child nutrition through group food service. I urge your support for this addition to the legislative framework that has been carefully built over a period of many years. The amendment is designed so that we may assist the States in improving the nutrition of children engaged in group activities other than schools. Specifically, this includes children in public or nonprofit private day-care centers, neighborhood houses, recreational centers, and various summer activities designed for needy children on a day-care basis.

Last year, in testifying on the group feeding proposals of the Child Nutrition Act, I said:

> The Administration goal for child nutrition is quite simple. It is to provide every child, regardless of the family's income, with access to a complete meal during the day when he or she is away from home.

That goal remains and we are asking your help in taking one more step to close the nutrition gap among children.

As you know, assistance under the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts is confined to schools. Since passage of the Child Nutrition Act we have been able to reach preschool children enrolled in school-sponsored programs. But we still cannot reach preschool children in private, nonprofit preschool programs; we cannot reach children in day-care centers or settlement houses; we cannot reach children during the summer months unless they are enrolled in summer school and the school keeps the cafeteria operating. We are saying, in effect, that we know the importance of good nutrition for children; we know that in early childhood poor nutrition can have lasting effects, physical and mental, but the children will just have to wait until they are old enough for school and even then good nutrition is only a 9-month effort.

The proposed legislation will enable us:

To reach children with a group food service in public or private nonprofit day-care centers, settlement houses, and private nonprofit preschool activities with a full range of Federal food assistance on a year-round basis.

To reach children engaged during the summer months in recreational programs such as day camps and youth centers, but not in full-care live-in institutions or camps.

It is contemplated that the program would be operated initially on a pilot basis reaching approximately 100,000 children the first year at a cost of $4.5 million. The majority of these children will probably participate during the summer months.

Assistance will be directed primarily to those activities serving children of low-income families, but where a program is in operation, all children will be able to participate.

In situations of severe need, we will be able to pay up to 80 percent of all operating costs of the food service program, just as we can do under the Child Nutrition Act breakfast program.

States will be permitted to use up to 25 percent of the funds apportioned to them to provide up to 75 percent of the cost of the equipment for use by eligible institutions to initiate or expand food service. This is consistent with the provision already in the Child Nutrition Act for equipment for the school lunch program and the breakfast program.

There is one point that I want to emphasize at the outset. This proposed amendment is based on the 20 years of continuing successful experience under the national school lunch program. Program administration will be in the hands of the same State educational agency that administers the lunch and child nutrition programs. They have 20 years of hard-won expertness in providing a food service for children that meets pretty stringent nutritional standards at a minimum cost to the child. This is by no means an easy job on a day-in, day-out basis, but they have learned how to do it.

It is my feeling that food service for children should be on a more rational, widely available basis. If children are participating in group activities away from home, whether it is a school situation or an activity sponsored on an organized basis by a public or nonprofit private agency, it makes sense to offer a food service that will make a positive contribution to a child's nutrition.

This amendment and our thinking as to its administration are patterned throughout on the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts. As I mentioned, administration will be handled through the State educational agency. There will be meal-type standards as in the lunch and breakfast programs; participating agencies will agree to serve nutritionally balanced meals in order to qualify for assistance. Meals will be served at reduced price or free to those who cannot afford the full price—just as in the lunch and breakfast programs. In situations of extreme need, the States may pay up to 80 percent of the operating costs—just as in the breakfast program. State agencies may use up to 25 percent of their apportioned funds to provide equipment to get a food service started or to expand an existing food service.

If a State educational agency cannot see its way clear to undertake the administration of this program, the Department of Agriculture will take direct agreements with eligible applicant institutions and supervise their operation under the program. This is entirely in line with our procedure under the National School Lunch Act where we have made agreements directly with nonpublic schools in some 29 States in those instances where the State educational agency cannot legally administer the program in nonpublic schools. It is entirely in line with our procedure under the special milk program, particularly in the case of eligible summer camps and child-care institutions. There

are a number of educational agencies which do not wish to or are unable to administer the milk program in nonschool activities.

Who and where are these children we want to reach?

As President Johnson pointed out in his message on America's children and youth, there are 5.5 million children under 6, and 9 million lion more under 17, in families too poor to feed and house them adequately. He went on to say:

> Head Start has dramatically exposed the nutritional needs of poverty's children. More than 1.5 million per-schoolers are not getting the nourishing food vital to strong and healthy bodies * * * I am recommending legislation to authorize a pilot program to provide school lunch benefits to needy pre-schoolers through Head Start and similar programs * * *

Some 60 percent of the children in year-round Headstart projects are in privately sponsored groups—35 percent in last summer's Headstart projects were in privately sponsored groups. We can help these children with the milk program and donated foods—useful help, yes, but not the full range of help we could extend if they were in school.

Great concern has been expressed by a number of Congressmen that even our lunch program is available to schoolchildren only 9 months of the year, although good nutrition is a year-round need. There are many, many group activities for children during the summer months where we could help provide improved nutrition. The provision of a food service, in itself, would attract still more youngsters to organized group activity.

The legislation we discuss here today will permit us to take one more step toward closing the nutrition gap among children.

Thank you for your kind attention. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. The chart which is attached to your paper as table 1, together with the tables consisting of 23 pages which you have furnished will be made a part of the record at this point.

(Table 1 and tabulations follows:)

U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service—Participation and coupon value, by project area, January 1967

[Food stamp program]

Project area	Participation (number of persons)			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total value	Bonus value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average bonus per person
Alabama (3):							
Greene (new)	99	2,803	2,902	$35,121	$22,415	64	$7.72
Jefferson	3,795	6,658	10,543	141,504	75,308	53	7.20
Walker	2,022	2,716	4,738	69,859	34,423	49	7.27
Total	5,916	12,177	18,093	246,484	132,146	54	7.30
Alaska (1): Nome	13	84	97	1,986	824	41	8.49
Arkansas (19):							
Arkansas	245	527	772	10,940	4,677	43	6.06
Bradley	235	339	574	8,776	3,299	38	5.74
Conway	768	390	1,158	18,364	6,784	37	5.86
Craighead	374	862	1,236	18,781	8,996	48	7.28
Crittenden	494	6,893	7,387	86,526	51,933	60	7.03
Faulkner	300	157	457	8,461	2,647	31	5.79

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service—Participation and coupon value, by project area, January 1967—Continued

[Food stamp program]

Project area	Participation (number of persons)			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total value	Bonus value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average bonus per person
Arkansas (19)—Continued							
Independence	701	646	1,347	$21,616	$9,339	43	$6.93
Izard	160	133	293	5,232	1,920	37	6.55
Jefferson	776	3,560	4,336	53,091	29,058	55	6.70
Lee	659	3,683	4,342	51,182	28,626	56	6.59
Lincoln	345	510	855	13,517	6,505	48	7.60
Lonoke	524	1,537	2,061	26,508	14,068	53	6.83
Mississippi	1,722	5,794	7,516	99,540	51,972	52	6.91
Monroe	487	2,073	2,560	32,306	18,453	57	7.21
Perry	372	84	456	8,256	2,570	31	5.64
Phillips	1,712	6,415	8,127	102,832	56,353	55	6.93
Prairie	365	192	557	9,128	3,424	38	6.15
Pulaski	2,157	1,506	3,663	55,101	21,885	50	5.97
St. Francis	1,139	3,985	5,124	61,450	36,065	59	7.04
Total	13,535	39,286	52,821	691,607	358,574	52	6.79
California (4):							
Contra Costa	7,348	1,542	8,890	169,492	45,445	27	5.11
Humboldt	1,659	736	2,395	43,182	12,611	29	5.27
Los Angeles	[1] 63,400	[1] 14,353	[1] 77,753	1,419,072	386,430	27	[1] 4.97
San Francisco	7,896	2,077	9,973	202,976	53,913	27	5.41
Total	[1] 80,303	[1] 18,708	[1] 99,011	1,834,722	498,399	27	[1] 5.06
Colorado (21):							
Adams	972	693	1,665	30,272	9,897	33	5.94
Alamosa	133	246	379	5,842	2,385	41	6.29
Arapahoe	925	245	1,170	23,702	6,976	29	5.96
Boulder	252	137	389	7,737	2,328	30	5.98
Clear Creek	19	5	24	510	156	31	6.50
Conejos	116	437	553	10,102	4,528	45	8.19
Costilla	29	226	255	4,409	1,782	40	6.99
Crowley	55	60	115	1,890	778	41	6.77
Custer (new)	26	3	29	646	196	30	6.76
Denver	8,579	2,051	10,630	223,734	68,367	31	6.43
Elbert	22	2	24	574	162	28	6.75
Gilpin	20	15	35	778	246	32	7.03
Huerfano	289	254	543	10,304	3,266	32	6.01
Jefferson	612	307	919	18,155	5,476	30	5.95
Larimer (new)	237	95	332	6,056	1,856	31	5.59
Las Animas	554	595	1,149	21,284	7,186	34	6.25
Mesa (new)	206	126	332	5,660	1,919	34	5.78
Otero	255	254	509	8,469	3,033	36	5.96
Pueblo	2,261	1,423	3,684	67,591	22,501	33	6.11
Rio Grande-Mineral	158	283	441	7,089	2,872	41	6.51
Weld (new)	653	207	860	15,085	5,368	36	6.24
Total	16,373	7,664	24,037	469,889	151,278	32	6.29
Connecticut (1): Waterbury district	[1] 2,010	[1] 1,356	[1] 3,366	63,764	17,842	28	[1] 5.30
District of Columbia (1): Washington	[1] 11,185	[1] 7,327	[1] 18,512	309,593	114,962	37	[1] 6.21
Georgia (18):							
Bibb	1,216	1,891	3,107	47,280	19,795	42	6.37
Burke (new)	132	516	648	7,036	3,070	44	4.74
Charlton	170	277	447	6,170	2,782	45	6.22
Clinch	108	112	220	3,299	1,323	40	6.01
Echols	67	94	161	2,436	912	37	5.66
Hall	255	325	580	9,918	3,692	37	6.37
Hancock (new)	77	228	305	3,935	1,947	49	6.38
Houston (new)	125	176	301	4,336	1,900	44	6.31
Lowndes	362	411	773	11,155	4,544	41	5.88
Lumpkin	187	112	299	4,670	1,870	40	6.25
Mitchell	304	725	1,029	14,311	6,495	45	6.31
Pulaski (new)	104	164	268	3,978	1,534	39	5.72
Rabun	212	309	521	8,656	3,394	39	6.51
Richmond (new)	453	436	889	13,614	4,717	35	5.31

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service—Participation and coupon value, by project area, January 1967—Continued

[Food stamp program]

Project area	Participation (number of persons)			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total value	Bonus value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average bonus per person
Georgia (18)—Continued							
Stephens	135	230	365	$5,990	$2,482	41	$6.80
Taliaferro (new)	34	39	73	1,170	522	45	7.15
Thomas	513	585	1,098	15,839	6,674	42	6.08
Washington (new)	29	144	173	[1] 2,636	[1] 1,081	[1] 41	[1] 6.25
Total	4,483	6,774	11,257	[1] 166,429	[1] 68,734	[1] 41	[1] 6.11
Hawaii (3):							
Honolulu	3,756	663	4,419	90,738	[1] 24,899	[1] 27	[1] 5.64
Kauai	207	69	276	5,670	[1] 1,557	[1] 27	[1] 5.64
Maui	400	171	571	9,518	[1] 3,220	[1] 34	[1] 5.64
Total	4,363	903	5,266	105,926	29,676	28	5.64
Illinois (39):							
Alexander	[1] 750	[1] 496	[1] 1,246	23,770	6,729	28	[1] 5.40
Bond (new)	[1] 100	[1] 52	[1] 152	2,819	788	28	[1] 5.18
Calhoun (new)	[1] 100	[1] 50	[1] 150	2,852	781	27	[1] 5.18
Clay (new)	[1] 150	[1] 125	[1] 275	4,879	1,427	29	[1] 5.18
Clinton (new)	[1] 40	[1] 22	[1] 62	1,164	322	28	[1] 5.18
Cook	[1] 76,500	[1] 7,111	[1] 83,611	1,580,796	427,253	27	[1] 5.11
Crawford (new)	[1] 100	[1] 66	[1] 166	3,023	859	28	[1] 5.18
Edwards (new)	[1] 50	[1] 21	[1] 71	1,133	370	33	[1] 6.18
Fayette (new)	[1] 150	[1] 59	[1] 209	3,885	1,081	28	[1] 5.18
Franklin	[1] 1,400	[1] 627	[1] 2,027	44,793	12,204	27	[1] 6.02
Gallatin	[1] 164	[1] 124	[1] 288	6,017	1,667	28	[1] 5.78
Greene (new)	[1] 125	[1] 58	[1] 183	3,529	950	27	[1] 5.18
Hamilton	[1] 103	[1] 73	[1] 176	3,620	1,110	31	[1] 6.29
Hardin	[1] 172	[1] 62	[1] 234	5,187	1,390	27	[1] 5.94
Jackson	[1] 545	[1] 276	[1] 821	15,902	4,501	28	[1] 5.48
Jasper	[1] 75	[1] 49	[1] 124	2,240	644	29	[1] 5.18
Jefferson	[1] 825	[1] 365	[1] 1,190	24,026	6,640	28	[1] 5.58
Jersey (new)	[1] 75	[1] 32	[1] 107	2,133	556	26	[1] 5.18
Johnson	[1] 86	[1] 94	[1] 180	3,493	1,057	30	[1] 6.88
Lawrence (new)	[1] 300	[1] 143	[1] 443	8,454	2,295	27	[1] 5.81
Macoupin (new)	[1] 200	[1] 55	[1] 255	4,714	1,323	28	[1] 5.18
Madison	[1] 2,000	[1] 1,044	[1] 3,044	38,192	10,807	28	[1] 3.55
Marion (new)	[1] 500	[1] 209	[1] 709	12,958	3,672	28	[1] 5.18
Massac	[1] 350	[1] 113	[1] 463	9,524	2,629	28	[1] 5.68
Monroe (new)	[1] 50	[1] 32	[1] 82	1,488	424	28	[1] 5.18
Montgomery (new)	[1] 100	[1] 41	[1] 141	2,637	732	28	[1] 5.18
Perry (new)	[1] 150	[1] 55	[1] 205	3,874	1,060	27	[1] 5.18
Pope	[1] 165	[1] 96	[1] 261	6,025	1,686	28	[1] 6.45
Pulaski	[1] 925	[1] 378	[1] 1,303	24,274	6,906	28	[1] 5.30
Randolph (new)	[1] 100	[1] 61	[1] 161	2,893	836	29	[1] 5.18
Richland (new)	[1] 75	[1] 27	[1] 102	1,768	530	30	[1] 5.18
St. Clair	[1] 10,000	[1] 1,425	[1] 11,425	235,951	64,097	27	[1] 5.61
Saline	[1] 800	[1] 464	[1] 1,264	27,899	7,786	28	[1] 6.16
Union	[1] 166	[1] 204	[1] 370	7,275	2,151	30	[1] 5.82
Wabash (new)	[1] 75	[1] 57	[1] 132	2,546	682	27	[1] 5.18
Washington (new)	[1] 20	[1] 12	[1] 32	658	168	26	[1] 5.18
Wayne (new)	[1] 125	[1] 48	[1] 173	3,267	894	27	[1] 5.18
White	[1] 250	[1] 52	[1] 302	6,160	1,764	29	[1] 5.85
Williamson	[1] 900	[1] 584	[1] 1,484	31,392	8,486	27	[1] 5.72
Total	[1] 98,761	[1] 14,862	[1] 113,623	2,167,210	589,257	27	[1] 5.19
Indiana (17):							
Bartholomew	215	174	389	6,139	2,354	38	6.05
Floyd	426	459	885	14,095	5,488	39	6.20
Gibson	428	209	637	9,674	3,986	41	6.25
Harrison	145	311	456	7,868	2,983	38	6.54
Knox	338	336	674	12,495	4,386	35	6.50
Lake	[1] 7,710	[1] 1,450	[1] 9,160	134,552	45,894	34	[1] 5.01
Madison (new)	746	87	833	9,683	3,746	39	4.50
Marion	3,890	1,866	5,756	96,343	34,055	35	5.92
Perry	392	257	649	10,592	4,018	38	6.19
Pike	288	117	405	5,759	2,508	44	6.19
Posey	169	365	534	8,077	3,267	40	6.12

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service—Participation and coupon valye, by project area, January 1967—Continued

[Food stamp program]

Project area	Participation (number of persons)			Coupons issued			
	Public assistauce	Non-public assistance	Total	Total value	Bonus value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average bonus per person
Indiana (17)—Continued							
Putnam	63	39	102	$1,353	$538	40	$5.27
Spencer	295	268	563	9,198	3,530	39	6.27
Switzerland	54	71	125	2,103	824	39	6.59
Tipton	106	32	138	2,469	785	32	5.69
Vanderburgh	2,223	1,592	3,815	63,435	22,354	35	5.86
Warrick	283	193	476	8,247	2,994	36	6.29
Total	[1] 17,771	[1] 7,826	[1] 25,597	402,082	143,710	36	[1] 5.61
Iowa (40):							
Adams (new)	28	19	47	964	296	31	6.30
Appanoose	325	172	497	10,783	3,150	29	6.34
Benton (new)	90	29	119	2,492	688	28	5.78
Butler	88	74	162	3,258	940	29	5.80
Calhoun	[1] 57	[1] 26	[1] 83	1,693	468	28	[1] 5.50
Cerro Gordo	273	33	306	6,008	1,635	27	5.34
Clarke	19	5	24	562	146	26	6.08
Dallas	183	53	236	5,058	1,498	30	6.35
Davis	32	45	77	1,425	418	29	5.43
Decatur	90	50	140	2,818	938	33	6.70
Des Moines (new)	153	149	302	5,685	1,670	29	5.52
Dubuque	730	377	1,107	18,444	5,702	31	5.15
Franklin	38	35	73	1,478	416	28	5.70
Greene	85	48	133	2,555	754	30	5.67
Grundy	19	4	23	470	162	34	7.04
Guthrie	93	39	132	2,624	814	31	6.17
Hamilton	115	7	122	2,604	672	26	5.51
Harrison (new)	39	69	108	[1] 2,166	[1] 628	[1] 29	[1] 5.82
Henry (new)	33	10	43	938	266	28	6.19
Ida	18	18	36	832	220	26	6.11
Jasper	152	65	217	4,154	1,229	30	5.66
Johnson	293	94	387	4,616	1,318	29	3.41
Lee (new)	212	105	317	5,935	1,657	28	5.23
Lucas	213	44	257	5,625	1,618	29	6.30
Madison	73	52	125	2,906	826	28	6.61
Marshall	102	26	128	2,465	721	29	5.63
Monona	98	95	193	3,837	1,263	33	6.54
O'Brien	112	48	160	3,308	909	27	5.68
Plymouth	57	11	68	1,532	390	25	5.74
Scott	813	470	1,283	22,006	6,599	30	5.14
Sioux	126	19	145	3,265	846	26	5.83
Tama (new)	82	38	120	2,349	652	28	5.43
Taylor (new)	27	42	69	1,361	442	32	6.41
Union (new)	84	30	114	2,536	692	27	6.07
Van Buren	102	27	129	2,728	750	27	5.81
Wapello	402	466	868	17,324	5,627	32	6.48
Warren (new)	81	54	135	[1] 2,710	[1] 786	[1] 29	[1] 5.82
Washington (new)	71	30	101	1,886	512	27	5.07
Wayne	122	39	161	3,388	1,032	30	6.41
Woodbury	1,946	554	2,500	48,386	13,929	29	5.57
Total	[1] 7,676	[1] 3,571	[1] 11,247	[1] 215,174	[1] 63,279	[1] 29	[1] 5.6
Kansas (5):							
Bourbon	[1] 158	47	205	4,234	1,229	29	6.00
Cherokee	[1] 619	77	696	14,385	4,036	28	5.80
Crawford	[1] 840	75	915	20,217	5,436	27	5.94
Labette	[1] 532	97	629	12,146	3,364	28	5.35
Wilson	[1] 123	21	144	2,509	804	32	5.58
Total	[1] 2,272	317	2,589	53,491	14,869	28	5.74
Kentucky (44):							
Adair	100	309	409	5,676	2,648	47	6.47
Bath	112	399	511	7,178	3,348	47	6.55
Bell	2,074	2,046	4,120	63,840	24,815	39	6.02
Breathitt	2,164	1,687	3,851	60,874	21,834	36	5.67
Campbell	[1] 266	[1] 342	[1] 608	9,060	3,857	43	[1] 6.34
Carter	215	845	1,060	14,746	7,662	52	7.23

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service—Participation and coupon value, by project area, January 1967—Continued

[Food stamp program]

Project area	Participation (number of persons)			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total value	Bonus value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average bonus per person
Kentucky (44)—Continued							
Casey	165	594	759	$10,326	$5,466	53	$7.20
Clark	96	157	253	3,890	1,612	41	6.37
Clay	1,200	2,700	3,900	56,058	25,172	45	6.45
Clinton	68	499	567	7,742	4,230	55	7.46
Cumberland	268	330	598	8,988	3,838	43	6.42
Elliott	199	325	524	7,748	3,250	42	6.20
Estill	340	655	995	14,870	6,694	45	6.73
Floyd	2,709	3,110	5,819	87,958	33,934	39	5.83
Harlan	2,343	3,333	5,676	84,520	34,496	41	6.08
Jackson	574	659	1,233	19,356	7,138	37	5.79
Jefferson	2,605	1,797	4,402	73,632	24,681	34	5.61
Johnson	744	1,841	2,585	37,282	18,032	48	6.98
Knott	2,886	2,507	5,393	82,658	30,380	37	5.63
Knox	1,848	2,485	4,333	65,642	26,144	40	6.03
Laurel	419	1,412	1,831	25,840	13,126	51	7.17
Lee	344	1,137	1,481	21,530	10,072	47	6.80
Leslie	1,696	1,681	3,377	51,148	20,278	40	6.00
Letcher	1,516	2,098	3,614	54,165	22,138	41	6.13
Lincoln	161	536	697	10,206	5,186	51	7.44
Logan	115	285	400	[1] 6,020	[1] 2,468	[1] 41	[1] 6.17
McCreary	574	1,340	1,914	26,996	12,622	47	6.59
Magoffin	1,113	1,955	3,068	44,486	19,812	45	6.46
Martin	1,483	1,167	2,650	40,272	15,358	38	5.80
Menifee	299	126	425	6,394	2,438	38	5.74
Montgomery	219	220	439	6,830	2,614	38	5.95
Morgan	619	780	1,399	20,506	8,682	42	6.21
Muhlenburg	194	398	592	9,170	4,074	44	6.88
Owsley	491	896	1,387	21,300	8,730	41	6.29
Perry	3,784	3,093	6,877	102,800	39,238	38	5.71
Pike	2,369	2,575	4,944	75,536	29,062	38	5.88
Pulaski	425	1,180	1,605	23,254	11,184	48	6.97
Rockcastle	218	894	1,112	15,654	8,000	51	7.19
Russell	89	533	622	8,314	4,634	56	7.45
Simpson	62	170	232	3,406	1,506	44	6.49
Todd	27	116	143	2,048	982	48	6.87
Wayne	192	1,230	1,422	18,716	10,864	58	7.64
Whitley	790	1,573	2,363	34,504	15,624	45	6.61
Wolfe	735	482	1,217	19,188	6,996	36	5.75
Total	[1] 38,910	[1] 52,497	[1] 91,407	[1] 1,370,327	[1] 564,919	[1] 41	[1] 6.18
Louisiana (22):							
Acadia	1,714	2,441	4,155	59,627	27,768	47	6.68
Assumption	281	1,270	1,551	17,151	9,043	53	5.83
Avoyelles	2,256	5,862	8,118	116,480	53,910	46	6.64
Calcasieu	1,536	1,339	2,875	41,632	17,539	42	6.10
Caldwell	154	446	600	9,694	4,417	46	7.36
East Baton Rouge (new)	273	488	761	7,909	3,925	50	5.16
Evangeline	3,742	5,512	9,254	138,386	60,914	44	6.58
Franklin	661	3,078	3,739	46,189	24,307	53	6.50
Iberia	709	710	1,419	19,867	8,062	41	5.68
Iberville	444	1,466	1,910	23,078	11,257	49	5.89
Jefferson Davis	612	520	1,132	16,714	6,445	39	5.69
Lafayette	1,015	2,735	3,750	47,654	24,565	52	6.55
Natchitoches	1,082	2,762	3,844	50,899	26,594	52	6.92
Pointe Coupee	827	1,749	2,576	35,044	15,278	44	5.93
Red River (new)	327	1,248	1,575	20,207	10,691	53	6.79
Richland	371	2,505	2,876	33,355	18,960	57	6.59
St. James	159	351	510	6,674	2,907	44	5.70
St. John	123	351	474	6,219	2,373	38	5.01
St. Landry	1,979	10,079	12,058	155,326	81,628	53	6.77
St. Martin	1,271	1,925	3,196	43,650	21,340	49	6.68
Vermilion	367	1,076	1,443	19,262	9,861	51	6.83
Winn	441	172	613	9,580	3,413	36	5.57
Total	20,344	48,085	68,429	924,597	445,197	48	6.51

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service—Participation and coupon value, by project area, January 1967—Continued

[Food stamp program]

Project area	Participation (number of persons)			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total value	Bonus value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average bonus per person
Maine (1): Androscoggin	726	858	1,584	$29,678	$9,521	32	$6.01
Maryland (9):							
Allegany	996	388	1,384	28,455	9,247	32	6.68
Anne Arundel	639	707	1,346	22,618	8,411	37	6.25
Baltimore	702	112	814	16,493	5,945	36	7.30
Caroline (new)	174	14	188	3,526	1,199	34	6.38
Charles	73	30	103	1,546	572	37	5.55
Dorchester	303	70	373	6,684	2,218	33	5.95
Garrett	339	320	659	12,625	4,428	35	6.72
Queen Annes	105	73	178	2,694	983	36	5.52
Talbot	109	53	162	2,702	967	36	5.97
Total	3,440	1,767	5,207	97,343	33,970	35	6.52
Michigan (6):							
Gogebic	643	387	1,030	19,905	5,703	29	5.54
Houghton	762	776	1,538	31,057	9,033	29	5.87
Macomb	2,062	565	2,627	53,766	16,379	30	6.23
Oakland	5,032	716	5,748	107,322	29,600	28	5.15
St. Clair	1,592	233	1,825	30,143	8,377	28	4.59
Wayne	[1] 35,000	[1] 10,099	[1] 45,099	855,554	248,496	29	[1] 5.51
Total	[1] 45,091	[1] 12,776	[1] 57,867	1,097,747	317,588	29	[1] 5.49
Minnesota (29):							
Aitkin	98	334	432	7,537	2,382	32	5.51
Anoka (new)	507	115	622	11,814	3,112	26	5.00
Becker	183	679	862	15,064	5,340	35	6.19
Beltrami	440	824	1,264	22,149	6,993	32	5.53
Benton (new)	37	218	255	4,181	1,377	33	5.40
Big Stone	137	137	274	5,313	1,512	28	5.52
Carlton	304	599	903	16,979	5,192	31	5.75
Chippewa	44	79	123	2,089	632	30	5.14
Crow Wing	171	670	841	16,614	5,120	31	6.09
Dakota (new)	464	170	634	12,204	3,269	27	5.16
Hennepin	5,150	2,253	7,403	166,776	40,900	25	5.52
Hubbard	76	445	521	9,458	3,417	36	6.56
Itasca	274	655	929	18,313	5,541	30	5.96
Kandiyohi	279	323	602	11,789	3,628	31	6.03
Koochiching	244	332	576	11,576	3,023	26	5.25
Lac qui Parle	56	231	287	5,052	1,526	30	5.32
Lake	22	121	143	2,489	857	34	5.99
Otter Tail (new)	76	7	83	3,066	778	25	9.37
Pine	148	229	377	7,509	2,238	30	5.94
Pipestone (new)	41	80	121	2,252	707	31	5.84
Polk (new)	188	271	459	8,334	2,524	30	5.50
Ramsey	5,888	2,360	8,248	168,497	44,966	27	5.45
Renville (new)	79	111	190	2,880	842	29	4.43
Roseau (new)	33	38	71	1,334	462	35	6.51
Stearns	248	946	1,194	19,811	7,108	36	5.95
St. Louis	4,077	3,086	7,163	145,084	38,622	27	5.39
Swift	66	229	295	6,035	1,760	29	5.97
Washington (new)	170	48	218	4,202	1,156	28	5.30
Wright (new)	65	170	235	3,741	1,267	34	5.39
Total	19,565	15,760	35,325	712,142	196,251	28	5.56
Mississippi (14):							
Attala (new)	465	1,672	2,137	27,160	14,659	54	6.86
Chickasaw	700	1,825	2,525	35,192	17,070	49	6.76
Clay	573	2,739	3,312	40,449	24,052	59	7.26
Coahoma	1,233	9,123	10,356	127,170	70,788	56	6.84
Forrest	780	1,970	2,750	36,553	18,851	52	6.85
Harrison	631	1,657	2,288	31,200	16,187	52	7.07
Jones	1,337	4,169	5,506	70,933	40,489	57	7.35
Lee (new)	951	1,283	2,234	34,006	15,578	46	6.97
Lowndes	844	1,950	2,794	38,016	19,500	51	6.98
Madison	919	4,708	5,627	68,803	39,748	58	7.06
Marion (new)	496	451	947	14,631	6,505	44	6.87

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service—Participation and coupon value, by project area, January 1967—Continued

[Food stamp program]

Project area	Participation (number of persons)			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total value	Bonus value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average bonus per person
Mississippi (14)—Continued							
Panola (new)	283	1,856	2,139	$27,305	$14,031	51	$6.56
Pike (new)	814	1,248	2,062	29,381	14,835	50	7.19
Yazoo (new)	1,241	3,194	4,435	59,374	30,754	52	6.93
Total	11,267	37,845	49,112	640,173	343,047	54	6.98
Missouri (1): St. Louis (city)	14,397	8,833	23,230	368,935	156,073	42	6.72
Montana (3):							
Cascade	1,405	1,046	2,451	43,067	15,087	35	6.16
Deer Lodge	88	189	277	5,592	1,606	29	5.80
Silver Bow	926	327	1,253	25,234	7,373	29	5.88
Total	2,419	1,562	3,981	73,893	24,066	33	6.05
Nebraska (18):							
Boone	48	24	72	1,594	480	30	6.67
Buffalo	250	86	336	5,654	1,649	29	4.91
Clay (new)	30	0	30	[1] 568	[1] 176	[1] 31	[1] 5.86
Custer	150	32	182	3,867	1,097	28	6.03
Douglas	3,952	1,410	5,362	100,323	31,100	31	5.80
Franklin (new)	18	17	35	657	258	39	7.37
Gage	99	18	117	2,832	718	25	6.14
Hall	[1] 200	[1] 82	[1] 282	5,415	1,574	29	[1] 5.57
Holt	30	17	47	989	300	30	6.38
Keith	15	9	24	554	150	27	6.25
Lancaster	1,007	544	1,551	30,190	9,426	31	6.08
Morrill	50	26	76	1,651	524	32	6.89
Nemaha	60	47	107	2,159	651	30	6.08
Sarpy	111	203	314	4,975	1,724	35	5.49
Saunders	93	140	233	4,102	1,520	37	6.52
Scotts Bluff-Banner	330	191	521	8,823	2,817	32	5.41
Sheridan	30	67	97	2,072	630	30	6.49
York	52	39	91	1,925	621	32	6.82
Total	[1] 6,525	[1] 2,952	[1] 9,477	[1] 178,350	[1] 55,415	[1] 31	[1] 5.85
New Jersey (2):							
Mercer	[1] 2,000	[1] 2,531	[1] 4,531	79,915	22,700	28	[1] 5.10
Salem	[1] 210	[1] 435	[1] 665	11,558	3,588	31	[1] 5.56
Total	[1] 2,210	[1] 2,966	[1] 5,176	91,473	26,288	29	[1] 5.08
New Mexico (15):							
Chaves	716	315	1,031	18,373	6,062	33	5.88
Colfax	234	174	408	[1] 7,094	[1] 2,544	[1] 36	[1] 6.26
Curry	615	424	1,039	17,350	6,523	38	6.28
Eddy	735	969	1,704	26,097	10,869	42	6.38
Harding	24	76	100	[1] 1,576	[1] 662	[1] 42	[1] 6.62
Lea	376	284	660	10,825	4,291	40	6.50
Mora	432	481	913	[1] 14,630	[1] 6,437	[1] 44	[1] 7.05
Quay	269	314	583	[1] 9,002	[1] 3,970	[1] 44	[1] 6.81
Rio Arriba	1,124	2,806	3,930	59,338	29,750	50	7.57
Roosevelt	271	553	824	12,587	5,532	44	6.71
Sandoval	449	1,492	1,941	27,121	15,432	57	7.95
San Miguel	1,794	2,026	3,820	[1] 62,121	[1] 26,091	[1] 42	[1] 6.83
Santa Fe	1,471	2,496	3,967	69,038	31,165	45	7.86
Taos	1,006	1,112	2,118	34,166	15,420	45	7.28
Union	100	33	133	[1] 2,546	[1] 893	[1] 39	[1] 6.72
Total	9,616	13,555	23,171	[1] 371,864	[1] 165,651	[1] 45	[1] 7.15
New York (1): Erie welfare district	15,090	4,931	20,021	387,607	109,237	28	5.46
North Carolina (22):							
Bertie	541	3,509	4,050	52,898	28,364	54	7.00
Cabarrus	158	106	264	4,350	1,890	43	7.16
Chatham	144	393	537	7,617	3,646	48	6.79
Chowan	103	591	694	8,956	5,152	58	7.42
Cleveland (new)	236	112	348	5,686	2,022	36	5.81

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service—Participation and coupon value, by project area, January 1967—Continued

[Food stamp program]

Project area	Participation (number of persons)			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total value	Bonus value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average bonus per person
North Carolina (22)—Con.							
Dare	64	55	119	$2,174	$764	35	$6.42
Durham	853	447	1,300	20,112	8,380	42	6.45
Forsyth	1,610	473	2,083	34,378	12,366	36	5.94
Franklin	454	1,376	1,830	24,306	12,084	50	6.60
Granville	101	760	861	10,722	5,900	35	6.85
Halifax	797	2,956	3,753	50,006	24,528	49	6.54
Harnett (new)	87	155	242	3,466	1,602	46	6.62
Lee	514	303	817	12,274	4,893	40	5.99
Martin	428	2,323	2,751	35,108	19,122	54	6.95
Moore	500	313	813	[1] 12,512	[1] 5,130	[1] 41	[1] 6.31
Nash	1,585	5,742	7,327	96,296	51,162	53	6.98
New Hanover	467	257	724	12,430	4,736	38	6.54
Northampton	457	1,362	1,819	23,337	12,191	52	6.70
Orange	340	324	664	9,334	4,279	46	6.44
Person	375	459	834	11,504	5,536	48	6.64
Scotland	457	708	1,165	18,490	7,905	43	6.79
Surry	374	720	1,094	16,058	7,684	48	7.02
Total	10,645	23,444	34,089	[1] 472,014	[1] 229,336	[1] 49	[1] 6.73
North Dakota (1): Morton	137	195	332	5,859	1,968	34	5.93
Ohio (27):							
Allen	885	173	1,058	18,750	6,229	33	5.89
Ashland (new)	112	24	136	2,737	760	28	5.59
Athens	[1] 700	[1] 351	[1] 1,051	19,552	6,738	34	[1] 6.41
Clark	832	461	1,293	24,715	8,202	33	6.34
Clermont	1,691	1,097	2,788	53,025	17,466	33	6.26
Columbiana	1,198	1,420	2,618	[1] 50,852	[1] 16,781	[1] 33	[1] 6.41
Cuyahoga	57,643	4,761	62,404	1,184,488	412,415	35	6.61
Franklin	12,800	1,635	14,435	261,979	92,893	35	6.44
Hamilton	19,200	5,982	25,182	473,180	158,260	33	6.28
Harrison	155	106	261	4,950	1,686	34	6.46
Holmes	88	15	103	2,234	722	32	7.01
Jefferson	1,263	477	1,740	34,270	11,912	35	6.85
Lake	404	60	464	9,550	2,858	30	6.16
Lawrence	2,013	1,247	3,260	59,398	22,978	39	7.05
Lorain	1,915	670	2,585	51,185	18,119	35	7.01
Lucas	13,727	1,884	15,611	297,079	102,372	34	6.56
Mahoning	3,768	2,392	6,160	102,461	34,786	34	5.65
Morgan	146	154	300	5,582	2,003	36	6.68
Montgomery	6,759	1,273	8,032	150,814	54,006	36	6.72
Richland	1,329	674	2,003	23,824	8,917	37	4.45
Scioto	3,394	892	4,286	79,911	28,844	36	6.73
Stark	2,458	920	3,378	65,576	22,223	34	6.58
Summit	8,987	1,247	10,234	181,431	62,443	34	6.10
Trumbull	1,805	1,015	2,820	49,012	16,807	34	5.96
Tuscarawas	713	167	880	16,930	5,826	34	6.62
Washington (new)	316	401	717	12,205	5,632	46	7.85
Wayne (new)	[1] 100	[1] 158	[1] 258	5,190	1,669	32	[1] 6.47
Total	[1] 144,401	[1] 29,656	[1] 174,057	[1] 3,240,880	[1] 1,123,547	[1] 35	[1] 6.46
Oregon (1): Multnomah	8,808	2,392	11,200	199,098	57,173	29	5.10
Pennsylvania (23):							
Allegheny	42,263	8,424	50,687	960,771	296,285	31	5.84
Bradford	1,495	673	2,168	39,609	13,084	33	6.04
Cambria	4,280	1,335	5,615	115,264	37,359	32	6.65
Clearfield	2,090	950	3,040	52,875	17,271	33	5.68
Clinton (new)	461	228	689	12,186	3,757	31	5.45
Dauphin (new)	3,170	375	3,545	57,955	16,774	29	4.73
Fayette	11,867	1,953	13,820	257,923	84,736	33	6.13
Greene	1,870	686	2,556	41,723	14,016	34	5.48
Huntingdon	978	396	1,374	26,489	8,641	33	6.29
Indiana	1,871	679	2,550	35,163	12,195	35	4.78
Lackawanna	4,141	2,355	6,496	120,155	39,243	33	6.04
Luzerne	5,628	3,119	8,747	158,526	52,027	33	5.95
McKean	969	407	1,376	24,214	7,681	32	5.58
Mifflin	673	227	900	14,124	4,505	32	5.01
Northumberland (new)	1,318	747	2,065	36,053	11,280	31	5.46
Philadelphia	35,974	12,657	48,631	793,317	261,480	33	5.38

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service—Participation and coupon value, by project area, January 1967—Continued

[Food stamp program]

Project area	Participation (number of persons)			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total value	Bonus value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average bonus per person
Pennsylvania (23)—Con.							
Potter	414	198	612	$9,961	$3,289	33	$5.37
Somerset	2,132	1,051	3,183	55,814	18,228	33	5.73
Sullivan (new)	106	57	163	[1] 2,897	[1] 927	32	[1] 5.69
Susquehanna (new)	540	283	823	11,835	3,701	31	4.50
Tioga	747	522	1,269	22,235	7,428	33	5.85
Washington	4,178	1,527	5,705	97,527	32,173	33	5.64
Wyoming (new)	181	76	257	4,730	1,511	32	5.88
Total	127,346	38,925	166,271	[1] 2,951,346	[1] 947,591	32	[1] 5.70
Rhode Island (4):							
Central Falls (city)	3,694	435	4,129	87,501	24,853	28	6.02
Pawtucket (city)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	------	------
Providence (city)	8,378	691	9,069	185,291	54,700	30	6.03
Woonsocket (city)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	------	------
Total	12,072	1,126	13,198	272,792	79,553	29	6.03
South Carolina (7):							
Cherokee	125	248	373	5,720	2,852	50	7.65
Dillon	234	4,763	4,997	60,528	37,838	63	7.57
Edgefield	99	546	645	8,976	4,774	53	7.40
Lee	187	3,221	3,408	40,048	25,910	65	7.60
McCormick	109	626	735	9,778	5,452	56	7.42
Williamsburg	448	6,334	6,782	85,334	49,398	58	7.28
York	205	935	1,140	15,326	8,346	54	7.32
Total	1,407	16,673	18,080	225,710	134,570	60	7.44
Tennessee (38):							
Anderson	576	1,845	2,421	35,065	16,474	47	6.80
Bledsoe	210	362	572	8,762	3,844	44	6.72
Campbell	656	3,238	3,894	55,354	29,032	52	7.46
Cannon	40	198	238	3,274	1,546	47	6.50
Chester	137	224	361	5,880	2,196	37	6.08
Claiborne	585	1,866	2,451	34,344	17,468	51	7.13
Cocke	193	762	955	13,476	6,968	52	7.30
Dyer	430	2,326	2,756	38,202	19,621	51	7.12
Fayette	119	6,139	6,258	74,267	44,756	60	7.15
Fentress	128	754	882	12,565	6,199	49	7.03
Grundy	214	435	649	9,690	4,706	49	7.25
Hamilton	2,495	3,148	5,643	86,691	34,724	40	6.15
Hancock	248	899	1,147	16,164	8,389	52	7.31
Hardeman	250	2,588	2,838	36,543	18,952	52	6.68
Hardin	270	853	1,123	16,950	7,361	43	6.55
Haywood	237	6,615	6,852	84,684	47,663	56	6.96
Henry	137	243	380	6,796	2,334	34	6.14
Knox	1,236	2,484	3,720	56,078	25,065	45	6.74
Lake	255	1,449	1,704	20,024	11,896	59	6.98
Lauderdale	303	3,899	4,202	55,488	29,596	53	7.04
Lawrence	169	428	597	9,652	3,887	40	6.51
Macon	86	152	238	4,176	1,654	40	6.95
Marion	417	1,277	1,694	24,843	11,622	47	6.86
McNairy	370	964	1,334	21,364	9,487	44	7.11
Meigs	41	104	145	2,118	988	47	6.81
Morgan	185	1,042	1,227	18,878	9,624	51	7.84
Pickett	47	221	268	3,590	1,892	53	7.06
Rutherford	263	372	635	9,353	3,954	42	6.23
Scott	780	2,280	3,060	44,578	20,414	46	6.67
Sequatchie	103	155	258	4,364	1,770	41	6.86
Sevier	104	283	387	5,876	2,832	48	7.32
Shelby	4,040	6,017	10,057	144,873	56,377	39	5.61
Smith	103	295	398	6,054	2,719	45	6.83
Sumner	107	454	561	8,012	3,944	49	7.03
Tipton	124	4,860	4,984	59,498	36,080	61	7.24
Trousdale	28	124	152	2,456	1,048	43	6.89
Weakley	128	215	343	5,744	2,282	40	6.65
Wilson	65	175	240	3,366	1,576	47	6.57
Total	15,879	59,745	75,624	1,049,091	510,940	49	6.76

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service—Participation and coupon value, by project area, January 1967—Continued

[Food stamp program]

Project area	Participation (number of persons)			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total value	Bonus value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average bonus per person
Texas (2):							
El Paso	889	1,670	2,559	$35,323	$17,364	49	$6.79
Tarrant	1,504	3,918	5,422	90,648	37,155	41	6.85
Total	2,393	5,588	7,981	125,971	54,519	43	6.83
Utah (17):							
Box Elder	124	27	151	2,522	812	32	5.38
Cache	180	118	298	6,607	2,301	35	7.72
Carbon	238	53	291	2,856	1,786	30	6.14
Davis	323	31	354	6,738	2,396	36	6.77
Emery	116	6	122	2,674	750	28	6.15
Garfield	95	10	105	2,010	638	32	6.08
Juab	55	12	67	1,606	454	28	6.78
Kane	16	9	25	580	163	28	6.52
Millard	68	7	75	1,465	416	28	5.55
Morgan	12	0	12	248	80	32	6.67
Piute	46	6	52	1,102	360	33	6.92
Rich	4	2	6	146	42	29	7.00
Sanpete	240	36	276	5,929	1,744	29	6.32
Sevier (new)	127	9	136	3,033	876	29	6.44
Utah	1,255	109	1,364	26,731	8,926	33	6.54
Wayne (new)	7	0	7	162	44	27	6.29
Weber	1,831	155	1,986	39,625	12,785	32	6.44
Total	4,737	590	5,327	107,034	34,573	32	6.49
Vermont (1): St. Albans welfare district	482	1,392	1,874	31,032	9,863	32	5.26
Virginia (7):							
Bristol (city)	376	542	918	13,827	5,929	43	6.46
Chesapeake (city)	725	570	1,295	18,231	6,721	37	5.19
Danville (city)	274	92	366	6,129	2,010	33	5.49
Dickenson	578	1,689	2,267	32,082	16,253	51	7.17
Lee	847	1,238	2,085	30,712	14,394	47	6.90
Norfolk	2,864	1,160	4,024	63,073	21,002	33	5.22
Wise	434	1,634	2,068	28,884	14,605	51	7.06
Total	6,098	6,925	13,023	192,938	80,914	42	6.21
Washington (23):							
Adams (new)	[1] 25	[1] 50	[1] 75	[1] 1,452	[1] 421	[1] 29	[1] 5.62
Asotin (new)	[1] 40	[1] 70	[1] 110	[1] 2,131	[1] 618	[1] 29	[1] 5.62
Benton	[1] 1,000	[1] 300	[1] 1,300	[1] 23,793	[1] 7,074	[1] 30	[1] 5.44
Clallam	[1] 500	[1] 191	[1] 691	[1] 14,034	[1] 4,070	[1] 29	[1] 5.89
Clark	[1] 1,400	[1] 361	[1] 1,761	[1] 35,042	[1] 10,498	[1] 30	[1] 5.96
Columbia (new)	[1] 35	[1] 15	[1] 50	[1] 969	[1] 281	[1] 29	[1] 5.62
Cowlitz	[1] 800	[1] 341	[1] 1,141	[1] 22,103	[1] 6,946	[1] 31	[1] 6.09
Franklin	[1] 525	[1] 109	[1] 634	[1] 12,397	[1] 3,719	[1] 30	[1] 5.87
Garfield (new)	[1] 7	[1] 3	[1] 10	[1] 193	[1] 56	[1] 29	[1] 6.62
Grays Harbor	[1] 1,300	[1] 556	[1] 1,856	[1] 34,517	[1] 10,300	[1] 30	[1] 5.55
Jefferson	[1] 160	[1] 34	[1] 194	[1] 3,996	[1] 1,079	[1] 27	[1] 5.57
Kitsap	[1] 900	[1] 157	[1] 1,057	[1] 21,564	[1] 6,038	[1] 28	[1] 5.71
Klickitat	[1] 200	[1] 58	[1] 258	[1] 5,268	[1] 1,633	[1] 31	[1] 6.34
Lewis	[1] 775	[1] 344	[1] 1,119	[1] 23,359	[1] 7,064	[1] 30	[1] 6.31
Lincoln (new)	[1] 15	[1] 10	[1] 25	[1] 482	[1] 140	[1] 29	[1] 5.62
Mason	[1] 180	[1] 39	[1] 219	[1] 4,600	[1] 1,288	[1] 28	[1] 5.89
Pacific	[1] 350	[1] 113	[1] 463	[1] 9,764	[1] 2,734	[1] 28	[1] 5.90
Skamania	[1] 125	[1] 98	[1] 223	[1] 3,248	[1] 1,072	[1] 33	[1] 4.80
Thurston	[1] 1,300	[1] 303	[1] 1,603	[1] 29,150	[1] 8,301	[1] 28	[1] 5.18
Wahkiakum	[1] 45	[1] 5	[1] 50	[1] 1,230	[1] 369	[1] 30	[1] 7.25
Walla Walla (new)	[1] 200	[1] 150	[1] 350	[1] 6,761	[1] 1,967	[1] 29	[1] 5.62
Whitman (new)	[1] 100	[1] 50	[1] 150	[1] 2,880	[1] 843	[1] 29	[1] 5.62
Yakima	[1] 5,546	[1] 825	[1] 6,371	[1] 122,100	[1] 34,592	[1] 28	[1] 5.43
Total	[1] 15,528	[1] 4,182	[1] 19,710	[1] 381,393	[1] 111,103	[1] 29	[1] 5.64

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service—Participation and coupon value, by project area, January 1967—Continued

[Food stamp program]

Project area	Participation (number of persons)			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total value	Bonus value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average bonus per person
West Virginia (40):							
Barbour (new)	[1] 347	[1] 700	[1] 1,047	$17,640	$7,510	43	[1] $7.17
Boone	[1] 1,126	[1] 2,000	[1] 3,126	56,322	22,102	39	[1] 7.07
Braxton	[1] 615	[1] 1,000	[1] 1,615	28,112	11,790	42	[1] 7.30
Cabell	[1] 484	[1] 1,000	[1] 1,484	28,608	10,638	37	[1] 7.17
Calhoun	[1] 311	[1] 400	[1] 711	12,096	5,100	42	[1] 7.17
Clay	[1] 980	[1] 1,022	[1] 2,002	34,398	14,876	43	[1] 7.43
Doddridge (new)	[1] 79	[1] 150	[1] 229	3,702	1,642	44	[1] 7.17
Fayette	[1] 2,351	[1] 4,015	[1] 6,366	109,640	46,342	42	[1] 7.28
Gilmer (new)	[1] 286	[1] 400	[1] 686	11,822	4,916	42	[1] 7.17
Greenbrier	[1] 568	[1] 1,195	[1] 1,763	30,094	13,310	44	[1] 7.55
Harrison (new)	[1] 312	[1] 600	[1] 912	15,174	6,540	43	[1] 7.17
Jackson (new)	[1] 312	[1] 600	[1] 912	16,120	6,540	41	[1] 7.17
Kanawha	[1] 3,405	[1] 6,038	[1] 9,443	163,096	68,842	42	[1] 7.29
Lewis (new)	[1] 300	[1] 518	[1] 818	13,392	5,862	44	[1] 7.17
Lincoln	[1] 1,753	[1] 2,284	[1] 4,037	70,860	28,986	41	[1] 7.18
Logan	[1] 2,365	[1] 4,027	[1] 6,392	113,178	44,490	39	[1] 6.96
Marion	[1] 366	[1] 600	[1] 966	17,274	6,930	40	[1] 7.17
Mason	[1] 223	[1] 500	[1] 723	11,534	5,182	45	[1] 7.17
McDowell	[1] 3,365	[1] 5,029	[1] 8,394	147,658	58,592	40	[1] 6.98
Mercer	[1] 1,689	[1] 1,956	[1] 3,645	66,438	26,642	40	[1] 7.31
Mingo	[1] 2,369	[1] 4,991	[1] 7,360	129,684	51,446	40	[1] 6.99
Monongalia (new)	[1] 220	[1] 400	[1] 620	10,670	4,448	42	[1] 7.17
Monroe	[1] 331	[1] 501	[1] 832	14,650	5,942	41	[1] 7.14
Nicholas	[1] 579	[1] 1,116	[1] 1,695	29,466	12,744	43	[1] 7.52
Pendleton (new)	[1] 112	[1] 200	[1] 312	5,160	2,240	43	[1] 7.17
Pocahontas (new)	[1] 155	[1] 300	[1] 455	8,024	3,262	41	[1] 7.17
Preston (new)	[1] 214	[1] 500	[1] 714	11,972	5,122	43	[1] 7.17
Putnam (new)	[1] 272	[1] 500	[1] 772	12,998	5,534	43	[1] 7.17
Raleigh	[1] 1,965	[1] 3,069	[1] 5,034	89,694	36,496	40	[1] 7.25
Randolph (new)	[1] 343	[1] 900	[1] 1,243	22,248	8,914	40	[1] 7.17
Roane (new)	[1] 325	[1] 754	[1] 1,079	18,268	7,738	42	[1] 7.17
Summers	[1] 785	[1] 1,270	[1] 2,055	35,608	15,332	43	[1] 7.46
Taylor (new)	[1] 150	[1] 248	[1] 398	6,836	2,852	42	[1] 7.16
Tucker (new)	[1] 75	[1] 127	[1] 202	3,444	1,444	42	[1] 7.16
Upshur (new)	[1] 353	[1] 500	[1] 853	14,964	6,106	41	[1] 7.16
Wayne	[1] 2,264	[1] 3,000	[1] 5,264	93,008	37,748	41	[1] 7.17
Webster	[1] 759	[1] 1,000	[1] 1,759	31,588	12,856	41	[1] 7.31
Wirt (new)	[1] 75	[1] 110	[1] 185	3,020	1,326	44	[1] 7.16
Wood (new)	[1] 356	[1] 500	[1] 856	14,140	6,132	43	[1] 7.16
Wyoming	[1] 1,409	[1] 2,000	[1] 3,409	58,522	24,410	42	[1] 7.16
Total	[1] 34,348	[1] 56,020	[1] 90,368	1,581,122	648,924	41	[1] 7.18
Wisconsin (16):							
Burnett	140	96	236	4,429	1,344	30	5.69
Crawford	182	265	447	7,969	2,653	33	5.94
Douglas	790	885	1,675	29,707	9,837	33	5.87
Dunn	188	203	391	7,290	2,431	33	6.22
Grant	287	169	456	8,710	2,586	30	5.67
Iron	52	124	176	3,508	982	28	5.58
Lafayette	75	131	206	3,301	1,063	32	5.16
Langlade	189	596	785	13,914	4,468	32	5.69
Milwaukee	11,664	2,817	14,481	247,170	73,984	30	5.11
Pepin	129	55	184	3,300	926	28	5.03
Pierce	101	112	213	3,650	1,087	30	5.10
Price	136	509	645	11,612	4,055	35	6.29
Rusk	225	357	582	10,175	3,267	32	5.61
St. Croix	58	102	160	2,652	816	31	5.10
Vernon	180	193	373	6,720	2,263	34	6.07
Waukesha	580	180	760	12,806	3,904	30	5.14
Total	14,976	6,794	21,770	376,913	115,666	31	5.31

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service—Participation and coupon value, by project area, January 1967—Continued

[Food stamp program]

Project area	Participation (number of persons)			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total value	Bonus value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average bonus per person
Wyoming (23):							
Albany (new)	107	123	230	$4,056	$1,298	32	$5.64
Big Horn	204	293	497	8,880	3,154	36	6.35
Campbell	73	22	95	1,555	582	37	6.13
Carbon	385	235	620	11,767	4,553	39	7.34
Converse	75	60	135	2,194	851	39	6.30
Crook	13	11	24	432	154	36	6.42
Fremont	150	159	309	5,669	1,919	34	6.21
Goshen	220	85	305	6,016	1,776	30	5.82
Hot Springs	73	35	108	2,349	783	33	7.25
Johnson	47	25	72	1,287	409	32	5.68
Laramie (new)	557	266	823	14,019	5,219	37	6.34
Lincoln	33	13	46	1,010	274	27	5.96
Natrona	726	521	1,247	22,350	8,418	38	6.75
Niobrara	31	30	61	1,196	339	28	5.56
Park	221	94	315	5,090	1,679	33	5.33
Platte (new)	80	60	140	2,637	778	30	5.56
Sheridan	413	102	515	10,362	3,227	31	6.27
Sublette	18	21	39	740	238	32	6.10
Sweetwater	261	143	404	6,984	2,554	37	6.32
Teton	18	0	18	384	104	27	5.78
Uinta	26	6	32	772	200	26	6.25
Washakie	141	84	225	3,924	1,301	33	5.78
Weston	29	99	128	2,189	928	42	7.25
Total	3,901	2,487	6,388	115,862	40,738	35	6.38
Grand total (589)	[1] 857,419	[1] 581,376	[1] 1,438,795	[1] 24,401,541	[1] 8,811,751	[1] 36	[1] 6.12

[1] Estimated.
[2] Combined with Central Falls.

TABLE I.—*Food stamp program—Selected program statistics for specified months*

Item	For the month of—				
	August 1964	June 1965	June 1966	January 1967 (preliminary)	June 1967 (projection)
Number of States	22	29	[1] 41	[1] 42	[1] 43
Number of areas	43	110	324	589	875
Number of participants	350,550	632,687	1,218,399	1,439,000	2,000,000
Number of retail food stores	13,300	18,000	42,200	51,900	88,000
Number of wholesale food stores	700	1,000	1,500	1,700	2,000
Monthly value of coupons issued:					
Total coupons	$5,865,057	$10,639,497	$20,577,786	$24,402,000	$34,000,000
Bonus coupons	$2,235,405	$3,988,717	$7,398,372	$8,812,000	$12,240,000
Percent of bonus coupons	38	37	36	36	36
Bonus coupons per person	$6.38	$6.30	$6.07	$6.12	$6.12

[1] Includes the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, we are very much obliged to you for bringing us this discussion of the two features of our nutrition program.

If there are questions of the Secretary, we will hear them. Are there any questions?

Mr. Kleppe?

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, my question is as to the radio spot and TV announcements on the food stamp programs and on many other programs. Are funds from the food stamp program being used to pay for these radio and TV spot announcements, or are they also a public service announcement?

Secretary FREEMAN. I would defer to Mr. Davis in connection with that. I, frankly, do not know.

Do you know anything about that?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KLEPPE. I have been thinking about this for some time.

Why do we have to spend money out of the program to advertise it? It is such a good program.

Mr. DAVIS. We do not spend 1 cent for that, Congressman Kleppe. That is all public service. Those are all public service announcements paid for by the station.

Mr. KLEPPE. This is true in all cases?

Mr. DAVIS. We do provide the materials which they use which have a nominal cost—the slides and some of the information.

Mr. KLEPPE. We thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McMillan?

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Secretary, I have had a number of letters from several counties in my district that have food stamp programs, and they are very much excited over the fact that someone has stated that the food stamp program would be ended in those counties this year. Do you have any information on this subject?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, sir; however, we are subject to the will of the Congress and adequate appropriations, but there is no plan on our part to cut back this program at all, but rather to meet the need which continues.

I would guess, Mr. McMillan, that that is a local question, because this program continues at the option of the local people, and if they do not provide the services to certify these people who are then entitled to it, of course, there would not be a program in that particular area.

Mr. MCMILLAN. This program has proved very satisfactory in my district.

Secretary FREEMAN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be eliminated, unless we pass this bill, will it not?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir. I said that a moment ago.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what we are talking about.

Secretary FREEMAN. That could be what they are talking about; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brasco.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Secretary, being from a city, certainly, I am very much in favor of the two programs you have outlined, but I want to ask a question, and it may be that it is a naive one, with respect to my colleagues here, because I cannot say that I can claim expertise in the area of agriculture, but it seems to me that we pay x amount of dollars in subsidies to our farmers, and we wind up with all types of agriculture surpluses; is that correct, as the result of that?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, sir.

Mr. BRASCO. It is not?

Secretary FREEMAN. I would say that is not correct.

Mr. BRASCO. Do we have agricultural surpluses?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, sir.

Mr. BRASCO. We do not?

Secretary FREEMAN. Not today, no.

Mr. BRASCO. When you came in here with members of your Department, and asked for food for India, is that food coming out of the surpluses or not?

Secretary FREEMAN. No. This is coming out of what we would call a reserve stock that we have which is carried over to protect the people of this country. There is a certain margin for use in our programs, for people everywhere around the world, and in our food-for-peace program, and the like.

Mr. BRASCO. My question is this: If we can afford to give this type of aid to India, cannot we afford to use this type of reserve here in the United States for our own people who are living in substandard conditions or under submutritional conditions?

Secretary FREEMAN. Indeed, we can, and I urgently hope that we shall.

Mr. BRASCO. May I ask you this question: What part of this reserve, this surplus, is going to be placed in this food stamp program or the child nutrition program?

Secretary FREEMAN. Neither of these programs would be related to any particular kind of commodity. They are all related, and accomplish dual objectives: (1) To get food to people who need it, nutritionally adequate food, and (2) to build up the demand for the production that we are capable of making. So, we have a dual goal here.

Mr. BRASCO. I know that you have the two goals. But the question is: Basically, how much of this do we use at home, of our surpluses, as opposed to what is sent abroad? That is what I am interested in finding out.

Secretary FREEMAN. Let me add to that, in this way, in rough numbers: The appropriation of our food-for-freedom program for use around the world is approximately $1,750 million. The appropriation for our program here at home, the school lunch program, the school milk program, direct distribution, the food stamp program is approximately $600,000, so we have a ratio of about 3 to 1—we spend about three times for food around the world as we use for concessional purposes here at home.

Does that answer the question?

Mr. BRASCO. Yes.

Secretary FREEMAN. And we are continually moving to do a better job of making our food abundance available at home.

Witness the report here today as to how this program that is now before you has so successfully reached out to involve more and more Americans.

Mr. BRASCO. Not to belabor this point, Mr. Secretary, but this bill, as I have said, is aid that is necessary, calls for the expenditure of more funds with respect to the program; is that correct?

Secretary FREEMAN. Correct; yes, sir.

Mr. BRASCO. The surplus we have represents an item that has already been paid for—well, it is a surplus, and there is no cost in the

distribution of that type of surplus. My question is: Should we not distribute more of that which does not represent any further costs in the program on the American people, rather than getting into programs which cost more money and represent a further burden on the public. That is, basically, what my question is. Obviously, if we can afford to send it overseas——

Secretary FREEMAN. The answer is that what you are really saying now is that we should have a direct distribution program instead of having the food stamp program, because, presumably, we have surpluses that we do distribute physically through direct distribution. I thing that is what you are saying.

The answer is that that program does not adequately meet the nutritional needs of the people. It is not nearly as effective a program in meeting the needs of the recipients in terms of assisting the local communities. And we will use more of our actual potential surplus through the medium of the food stamp program, because such things as dairy and meats and more nutritional items, particularly those that are animal products that consume larger quantities of actual potential grain surpluses, will be used.

The question is rather academic today, because we do not have any surpluses. What we have today is a certain margin that we can use. We continue the direct-distribution programs. But in this respect, we no longer have burdensome surpluses with which to contend; and, therefore, we move, very logically I think, in the direction of a program which will accomplish the nutritional goals and at the same time have the good result of economic expansion as well.

Mr. BRASCO. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Abernethy.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Secretary, what is the criteria, if any, laid down by the Department of Agriculture as to who should receive the food stamps?

Secretary FREEMAN. The criteria is established, not by the Department of Agriculture, but by the local welfare authorities, and it is entitlement under the terms of the assistance program, the joint Federal-State public assistance program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I know that, but the criteria which they establish must be approved by the Department of Agriculture, of course.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All right. Do you have a generally established set of rules that the members of the committee might examine to determine just what sort of criteria the Department approves, or do you have any guidelines or limitations as to who can or who cannot get stamps.

Secretary FREEMAN. Do you want to respond to that in more detail?

Mr. DAVIS. Generally speaking, what the Secretary has just said, is that the main requirement is contained in our regulations and that is, in developing eligibility requirements, the States must follow generally, the principles which they follow for their own public assistance programs.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I dislike to interrupt you, but you do not limit stamps to those who receive public assistance. These stamps will not only go to people who receive public welfare and public assistance, as

we call it, they go to people who are not eligible to receive public welfare and public assistance.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. These standards that we will accept from the States for the eligibility of these nonpublic welfare families must follow, generally, the same standards as are used for the welfare recipients.

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, no.

Mr. DAVIS. In other words——

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, no.

Mr. DAVIS. As far as income is concerned. There are additional requirements.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Wait just a minute. Wait just a minute.

When it is determined by a welfare officer that the income of the family is x number of dollars, that, of itself, does not determine the quantity of stamps that that family receives, because there are people, numbers of them, thousands of them, who receive stamps who have incomes over and above the income which makes them eligible for welfare service; that is right, is it not?

Mr. DAVIS. Those families would not be eligible for the food stamp program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There are people over and above the welfare level who should be receiving stamps to improve their health, you have argued.

Mr. DAVIS. Not as far as income is concerned. There are many places where families have an employable person who, regardless of their income, are not eligible for public assistance, unless they come under the aid for dependent children and the aid for the aged.

Those particular categories are not eligible for public assistance.

This group, by an large, in addition to the welfare family to whom we make the food stamp program available, their eligibility, so far as income is concerned, is generally pretty close to the income that a family can have and still get public assistance.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If I understand what you are saying now—I do not know whether I do or not—you are saying to me that there are people who are eligible to receive food stamps who are not eligible to receive public welfare?

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All right. What is the ceiling?

Mr. DAVIS. The ceiling is on your income. And it is about at the level of the income that is used for public assistance, but this group is not eligible for public assistance because they are not aged, because they are not disabled, or because they are not blind, or because they are a family not eligible for aid to dependent children because they have some employable person in the family.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All right.

Do you not have regulations establishing guidelines and levels of income?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And things of that kind?

Mr. DAVIS. We have.

Mr. ABERNETHY. To guide the people back in the States in determining whether or not the Federal Government will put up the food stamps which is money—it is not really stamps—in determining whether the Government will put up the money for that family to purchase part of its food; you have guidelines for that?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; we have regulations. And we also have individual plans of operation for each State in which these guidelines for that particular State are outlined more specifically.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Then, the guidelines are not uniform—it depends upon the communities, the income of the particular area, things of that kind?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. Generally, the plan of operation is tailored to the particular situation in a particular State and their own particular administration and guidelines for their own public assistance programs. It does vary among the States.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You do publish some limited form of guideline, I imagine?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if those could be made available to the members of the committee. I am sure that the Department can do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not mean at the moment, but at a later time when convenient.

Secretary FREEMAN. We will, sir, do that. Let me see if I can clarify that a little bit. We will be glad to submit the guidelines for the record.

(The guidelines referred to follow:)

GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY OF HOUSEHOLDS AS CONTAINED IN SECTION 1601.3 OF THE REGULATIONS FOR THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

1601.3 HOUSEHOLD ELIGIBILITY

(*a*) Eligibility for and participation in the Program shall be on a household basis.

(*b*) Households in which all members thereof are recipients of welfare assistance under (1) federally aided public assistance programs, or (2) State or local general assistance programs applying the criteria of need which are the same as, or similar to, those applied under any such federally aided programs, shall be determined to be low-income households and, therefore, eligible to participate in the Program while receiving such benefits.

(*c*) Other households, including those in which some members are recipients of the types of assistance set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, shall be determined to be low-income households and, therefore, eligible to participate in the Program if the economic status of the members who are not recipients of welfare assistance meet the standards of eligibility established in accordance with § 1601.1(f).

(*d*) Any other households meeting criteria of eligibility specifically approved by C&MS may be determined to be low-income households and, therefore, eligible to participate in the Program while meeting such criteria.

The income eligibility standards established in State plans approved under the Food Stamp Act of 1964 are as follows:

Food Stamp Program

Eligibility standards for nonassistance households

[Standards in State plans approved under the Food Stamp Act of 1964] [1]

State	Monthly allowable income by household size										Additional for each person	Resources—Allowable liquid assets [2]
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Alaska [3]	$125	$185	$250	$315	$370	$430	$475	$520	$565	$610	$45	Same as for public assistance.
Alabama [4]	100	120	145	175	205	235	265	295	325	350	$30	4 times monthly scale.
Arkansas [4]	85	170	180	190	200	210	220	235	250	265	$15 to maximum of $325	1—$200; 2 or more—$400. [2]
California [4]	160	190	225	283	335	393	438	483	521	565	$40	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Colorado [4]	100	150	185	220	255	290	325	360	395	420	None	1, 2, 3—$1,000; add $250 each to maximum of $2,000. [2]
Connecticut [5]	140	185	235	280	335	365	395	420	445	470	$25	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
District of Columbia [4]	107	153	198	226	254	283	311	339	367	396	$25	Do.
Georgia [4]	80	130	175	195	225	245	260	275	290	300	$30 to maximum of $330	1—$800; 2 or more—$1,600.
Hawaii [4]	120	180	210	250	285	325	370	415	455	495	11—$535; 12—$575; 13—$615; 14—$655; 15—$695. (Each additional, plus $40.)	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Illinois	139	182	212	259	299	437	375	414	451	490	$25	1—$400; 2 or more—$600.
Indiana	125	160	190	220	250	280	310	340	370	400	$25	3 times monthly scale.
Iowa	130	200	250	295	330	370	405	455	490	540	$35	1—$750; 2—$900; 3—$1,000; 4—$1,100; 5—$1,200; 6—$1,300; 7—$1,400; 8—$1,500; 9, 10, and over—$1,550.
Kansas	([6])	([6])	([6])	([7])	([6])	([6])	([6])	([6])	([6])	([6])		1—$750; 2 or more—$1,250. [2]
Kentucky [4]	90	125	145	165	190	210	220	230	240	250	$10	4 times monthly scale.
Louisiana [4]	90	105	125	150	175	190	210	230	250	275	$20	1—$500; 2 or more—$1,000.[2]
Maine	130	161	191	217	239	260	282	304	316	321	11—$325; $5	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,200.
Maryland	90	125	150	175	210	230	250	270	290	310	$20	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Michigan	125	185	225	265	295	330	365	400	435	470	$35	1—$750; 2 to 5—$1,000; 6 and over—add $100 each.
Minnesota	135	205	250	290	335	370	390	425	460	495	$30	1—$750; 2 or more—$1,000.
Mississippi [5]	90	130	155	180	210	230	250	270	290	310	$15	1—$500; 2 or more—$800.
Missouri [4]	140	190	230	270	310	350	390	430	470	510	$40	1—$750; 2—$1,000; 3—$1,250; 4 or more—$1,500.
Montana [4]	125	183	212	253	290	318	353	388	413	438	$25	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Nebraska	120	180	230	270	305	335	360	385	410	435	$25	1—$750; 2 or more—$1,500.
New Jersey	150	200	250	290	330	360	390	430	460	500	$40	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
New Mexico [4]	110	150	170	190	210	230	250	270	290	310	$20	Cash: 1—$100; 2 or more—$150.[2]
New York	150	210	290	325	365	405	445	485	525	565	$40	3 times maximum allowable income.[2]
North Carolina [4]	85	110	125	140	155	170	185	195	205	215	$5 to maximum of $240	1—$500; 2—$700; add $50 each to maximum of $800.

Food Stamp Program

Eligibility standards for nonassistance households

State	Monthly allowable income by household size										Additional for each person	Resources—Allowable liquid assets [2]
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
North Dakota	140	185	260	295	330	365	385	415	440	460	$25	$1,000 per household.
Ohio	110	180	220	260	290	320	355	385	415	445	$30	$500 per household.
Oregon	128	193	221	258	288	328	357	386	411	426	$25	1 adult—$500; 2 or more—$1,000.
Pennsylvania	110	170	205	245	280	315	350	390	425	460	$30	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Rhode Island	110	150	180	215	255	290	320	345	370	395	$25	Do.
South Carolina [4]	70	90	105	115	125	135	145	155	165	175	$5 to maximum of $185	4 times monthly scale.
Tennessee	95	130	165	200	240	275	315	350	385	420	None	1—$500; 2 or more—$1,000.
Texas	100	150	170	190	210	230	250	270	290	310	$15	1—$300; 2—$450; add $50 per person to maximum of $600.[2]
Utah	104	154	184	205	235	255	284	298	316	329	11—$343; 12—$357; 13—$370; 14—$384 plus $13.	1—$400; 2 or more—$800.[2]
Vermont	122	180	209	238	275	309	345	374	407	439	$30	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Virginia	90	115	135	150	165	180	195	210	225	240	$5	1—$500; 2—$600; 3 or more—add $50 each to maximum of $1,000.[2]
Washington	136	172	212	242	271	297	329	360	390	420	$30	1—$336; 2—$572; 3—$612; 4—;$462; 5—$671; 6—$697; 7—$729; 8—$760; over 8—add $30 each.
West Virginia	80	115	135	155	170	185	200	200	200	200	None	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Wisconsin	115	170	205	240	270	320	350	380	410	440	$30	1—$500; 2—$750; add $100 each additional.
Wyoming	130	180	225	280	310	340	370	415	460	500	None	$1,000 per household.[2]

[1] This table lists standards in State plans approved as of July 15, 1966. As additional plans are approved, supplements will be issued.

[2] The States indicated also have limitations on other resources such as real estate, automobiles, etc.

[3] Rent up to maximum of $75 is also allowed.

[4] For households containing both public assistance recipients and nonrecipients, eligibility is based on the income and resources of the nonassistance members only. Other States base eligibility on the total income and resources of all members.

[5] Applied to both public assistance and nonpublic assistance households.

[6] Household eligible if a budget deficit exists.

Secretary FREEMAN. Let me put it this way, which might be a little clearer:

No. 1, if the public certification is made by the local welfare authority which they apply generally, why, that person is clearly entitled.

No. 2, there is an area where there are other reasons that disqualify a person for relief assistance other than the matter of income. They are below the income level. This gets into whether you have someone in the house or not that should be employed. This gets into that aid to dependent children problem. And in this instance, although there cannot be a direct payment of funds under these programs, food can be made available, not to let them starve; and

No. 3, there are a few cases, and this is a flexible standard, where in some areas they may not be able to qualify in terms of their relief and the amount of money that they have coming in, nonetheless, because they have a little bit more, they are a little more lenient in a number of places in cooperation with the local people in regard to making food available than they would be under Federal standards, generally, in regard to making money available.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I ask this further question, then, Mr. Secretary? I started to use the word "imposed," but I hesitate to do so. You require—instead of "imposing"—the county or the municipality to become eligible for the distribution of these stamps to assume a responsibility and the cost of managing the program in this particular locality. How do you arrive at that?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, we merely have them accomplish the end result. In other words, we require——

Mr. ABERNETHY. They provide all of the cost of the administration; is that it?

Secretary FREEMAN. In fact, that is right. They administer it. In certifying the people, in distributing the stamps to the people. We participate by way of reviewing or more or less keeping surveillance over the retail outlets.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What did the administration cost last year throughout the United States for these programs?

I am now speaking of the Federal, State and municipal cost; the entire cost?

Secretary FREEMAN. The entire cost?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am not speaking of the cost of the stamps but the cost of the administration of the program.

Secretary FREEMAN. Can we give you that figure for the record?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would like to have some estimate of it here this morning, if you can get it.

Miss KELLEY. We can give the Federal. We do not require——

Mr. ABERNETHY. You do not know how much the cost is then?

Miss KELLEY. We do not have that kind of detailed report.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You do not have it in the Department?

Miss KELLEY. No, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Then, the Department does not know what percentage of public cost there is as related to the distribution—that is, as related to the "per dollar" worth of stamps. You do not know whether it is 5 percent or 10 percent or 20 percent or 50 percent?

Miss KELLEY. We do not require detailed reports. We have some limited information from some localities that have provided this to us.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I know of some countries that have been complaining about the cost. They have been reluctant to move into the program, because of the cost.

I understand that it is because of the cost resulting from the guidelines that were laid down by the Department, in order to qualify for the program.

I think that when we have a program of this kind, and I am sure that you do too, Mr. Secretary, that the public ought to know what it is costing and that the Federal cost is not the entire cost. It costs the State, it costs the county, it costs the Federal Government, too. I do not know how much benefit we are getting out of this; I am sure that we are getting some; but I would like to be able to tell my people, because I have had people ask me and I have had to say I did not know but that I would try to find out. That is the reason I am asking these questions.

Secretary FREEMAN. I think that is a very useful question.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think so.

Secretary FREEMAN. And useful information.

(The information requested was supplied as follows:)

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

For the fiscal year 1967, a total of $6,000,000 is available for Federal administrative costs. By June 30, 1967, the program is scheduled to be in operation in 875 areas. At that time, the number of persons employed for administering the program is expected to be 831, less than one employee per operating area.

STATE AND LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

The Department of Agriculture does not have detailed data on the costs incurred by States and localities in administering the program. Based upon available data for a limited number of areas, it appears that some of the very smallest areas are able to utilize existing staffs and facilities to minimize additional out-of-pocket costs. In a medium-sized area, such costs may range between $3 to $5 per person per year. In the large metropolitan areas, such per-person costs probably would be higher—reflecting, in part, higher salary cost. Based upon these data, together with information on the charges paid in those areas where banks issue the coupons, it is estimated that such State and local costs would be about $5,000,000 in fiscal 1967.

Secretary FREEMAN. May I make it very clear that administration of the food stamp program is fairly costly. The law as set down by the Congress required, for example, the use of career and professional services in certification. Congress made it clear that they wanted to avoid and prevent some of the waste, some of the leakage, some of the difficulties that we had with direct distribution, but this is no more costly than it is to run a relief program and have to certify people for relief anyway.

Mr. ABERNETHY. When you say "it requires professional and career people," what do yon have reference to, what kind of career and what sort of professional people?

Secretary FREEMAN. That depends upon the standards that they follow in the State, generally, in the certification of people for their own relief programs. In other words, if that county is going to pay out dollars to certify someone to receive relief, which most counties of the United States do, the same standards that they use to decide who is entitled to the relief, the same level of trained personnel that they use for their own money expenditures, we expect them to use those for the Federal money expenditure.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But this is, generally, welfare personnel, is it not?

Secretary FREEMAN. Generally, welfare personnel.

Mr. ABERNETHY. People who go out and interview the prospective clients—I guess you call them clients.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And then by some method they have established, to determine whether or not this person will be eligible or that this one will not be eligible.

Does this bill make the program a permanent program of the Government?

Secretary FREEMAN. It is a permanent authorization, yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. A permanent authorization?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is from now on.

How much did it cost last year?

Mr. DAVIS. This current fiscal year, we estimate it will run about $125 million. The last fiscal it was about $70 million.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is an advance of about 60 or 70 percent. What did it cost the previous year?

Mr. DAVIS. Around $35 million.

Mr. ABERNETHY. About $35 million. What was it the year before that? No, that covers it. $35 million, and then $70. You have 3 years on this program.

Mr. DAVIS. This is the third year.

Mr. ABERNETHY We are on the third year?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is, Federal money?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is for the administration of the stamp program, I assume that is right.

Mr. DAVIS. That is the total cost, yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The second year, it was $70 million, the third year it was $125 million, almost doubled. What will it be the next year?

Mr. DAVIS. We are requesting an appropriation of $195 million for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What are you requesting for 1969?

Secretary FREEMAN. I really do not know, but it will depend upon how many counties and how many cities around the United States want the program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All right.

How many counties are there in the United States?

Secretary FREEMAN. Roughly, 3,000.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How many are now qualified?

Secretary FREEMAN. There will be roughly, we think, at the end of this fiscal year, about 1,000—actually about 870.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And there are three times as many counties.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is a horseback number, but it is fairly close to that figure.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am trying to get more than horseback information. We have 1,000 counties now.

Secretary FREEMAN. There are three thousand and one or two hundred counties.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It has grown substantially. I think that we can anticipate that it will be more.

I have one or two other questions, if you will allow me.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think that we should have these answers or information in the record.

This committee, as I understand it, got jurisdiction of this matter because it was brought to us as a means of disposing of surplus commodities which Mr. Brasco referred to a moment ago. Otherwise, I guess that the jurisdiction would be in another committee, just as the school-lunch program is. But that is the way that it came to us.

Secretary FREEMAN. You mean the school-lunch program is under the jurisdiction of another committee?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes, sir.

Secretary FREEMAN. It is under the jurisdiction of this committee.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It was moved to the Committee on Education and Labor—the school-lunch program is under the Committee on Education and Labor.

Secretary FREEMAN. I think we are talking about the Child Nutrition Act and the school-lunch program—excuse me.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Anyhow, we had it come to this committee, as a means of disposing of surplus commodities. There was a need to handle these commodities, to distribute them, and at the same time there were a tremendous number of counties where people were selling groceries, and so forth, and in giving away these commodities, it limited them in their business, so that this program affected the wholesale and retail grocer.

Do I understand now from your answer to Mr. Brasco that there are no more surplus commodities, so that the program now is purely on the basis of seeing to it that our people have a good balanced diet, or a move in that direction?

Secretary FREEMAN. No—I have to say "Yes" and "No," and then to ask permission to explain what seems to be a conflicting answer.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All right. That is permissible.

Secretary FREEMAN. No. 1, we do not have the surpluses, the very heavy depressing surpluses that we had at one time, of which you are aware.

We do have, however, a very considerable overproduction capacity remaining in American agriculture.

The amount of carryover that we have from time to time will vary, according to production, which we are all aware of. We may have 400 million bushels of wheat at the end of the crop year: we may have 300 million bushels of wheat at the crop year, going into the next year, depending on whether it rains within the next few weeks, which will make a difference of 100 million bushels of wheat. It will mean we are going to have more or less wheat to use, let us say, in the direct distribution program, and we will have more or less to use in the world program.

So that this is going to vary. Sometimes we have more and sometimes we have less. We are well aware of this.

We have more to go out through these direct distributions that go around the world, sufficient to protect ourselves with adequate reserves. That is one side of the coin.

That is why I say that it does not lend itself to any black and white criteria.

At the same time, we have a significant overproduction capacity. We can produce a lot more hogs and poultry; we can produce a lot more corn—a lot more of a number of things. In this respect, we want to produce more; we want to use our productive plant; we want our farmers to produce; we want them to make money. We want our economy to be healthy. We want to meet the needs of our people for food.

And in this respect now, we are calling on more and more of that unused capacity to the extent that we are here at home meeting the needs of our people, including those who need more food, because they cannot afford to pay for it. And to this extent, then, this food stamp program is directly related. It actually increases our domestic demand; it helps our farmers; it uses more of our surplus capacity than the direct distribution program could, because we are going to use a lot more grain. That is our No. 1 capacity potential. If we put that grain into an animal and get some kind of meat; if we put it through an animal and get some more milk—we are, also, going to use some capacity, if we add fruits and vegetables, and other things, that they ought to have as a part of their diet.

That is a very long-winded "yes-and-no" answer, but I am trying to lay this down to show you the two sides of it. And it does not lend itself to precise calculation. But, the more that we move our agricultural abundance and our production capacity into use in meeting the needs of the American people, in my best judgment, why, we are contributing enormously to the country and to the agriculture producers and to the person who needs that food.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think, Mr. Secretary—and I go back to your answer to Mr. Braco where you stated that we do not have surplus commodities, and, therefore, this program is no longer predicated, that it cannot be predicated, on the basis that food stamps are a means of disposing of the surplusage of agriculture production.

Now, this agency goes into a county and tells the people there will not be any more commodities distributed in that area, once they come under the food stamp program. Is that correct?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I have some counties where some people do not like that idea. I have a county right now where many want to continue the commodity idea. Some have the food stamp program. What do you do in those instances?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is up to them to decide.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is up for their decision?

Secretary FREEMAN. They make the decision.

Mr. ABERNETHY. OK. The principal objective of the food stamp program is to provide food, to increase the quality of the food for our people; is that right?

Secretary FREEMAN. And to contribute to the——

Mr. ABERNETHY. For the needy?

Secretary FREEMAN. And to contribute to the agricultural economy of the country by utilizing as much of the excess production capacity as we can effectively, efficiently, prudently, and consistently do.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You have done a good job: you have gone back.

Secretary FREEMAN. I had that in mind. I think we should be back where we started. We have a lot of excess capacity now in this country, and we ought to use it. And I said "capacity" now.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Oh, "capacity."

Secretary FREEMAN. I said "capacity." I did not say surplus food products. We do not have that, but we have a lot of capacity.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Why should not that move through the normal channels of trade?

Secretary FREEMAN. Because the people cannot afford to pay for it. It costs more money to buy a beef steak than it does to buy cornmeal mush.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Which would be the most costly? Which would be the most costly, to increase, to expand the eligibilty for welfare, to increase the number and amount of food made available on welfare, in that sort of a program, or the present welfare and food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I think that we know. Let me say this: It would cost no more one way or another, with one exception, and that would be that the requirements be a bit more lenient in regard to the food. To the extent that they are more lenient than on nonfood items, it would cost just that much more. But the advantage of the food tieup is that they use what they have been spending on food, secure the stamps which then means an additional amount—which means that the money is going for food. It is not going for something else. This is very important, very important.

In my own experience as Governor, I observed again and again people, particularly old folks——

Mr. ABERNETHY. The welfare department handles that.

Secretary FREEMAN. They cannot handle it. They do not handle it. What they do is give them the money. When they give them the money they do not use it for food. They go out and play bingo with it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The welfare department could give them the same thing; they could do that.

Secretary FREEMAN. The food stamps.

Mr. ABERNETHY. They could, if they were authorized to do so, yes.

Secretary FREEMAN. They do give them the food stamps now, yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is what I know; I know that. Is the school breakfast program now in operation?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Have you made or come to any conclusion about the possibility of making that a permanent program and expanding it?

Secretary FREEMAN. We have not so recommended at this time. It was authorized by Congress as a pilot program. It is just getting rolling now, and we have not reached any point of recommendation.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How many areas are it in?

Mr. DAVIS. As of last Friday, the program was operating in 211 schools, in 40 States. These 211 schools had an average daily attendance of around 82,000 students, and 27,500 of those students were eating breakfast. Out of those 27,500, 19,000 were getting breakfast free.

As you will recall, this legislation was passed just in October. A supplemental appropriation came somewhat later, so that the first programs were not started until the first week in January.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand that. Can you put a figure of those into the record; that is, as to the schools?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Those that are operating now?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

(The information follows:)

Summary of breakfast programs operating under provisions of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (by State and Territory)

[Private and public schools]

State	Number of schools	Average daily attendance	Average daily participation	Number of free or reduced price breakfasts served daily
Alabama	2	1,378	753	334
Alaska	1	60	36	31
Arizona	7	4,626	737	629
Arkansas	11	4,675	858	564
California				
Colorado	7	3,451	602	92
Connecticut				
Delaware	6	3,171	226	85
District of Columbia				
Florida	4	2,918	269	175
Georgia				
Guam	1	737	200	50
Hawaii	1	362	200	35
Idaho				
Illinois	6	6,287	997	10
Indiana	5	3,320	718	[2]
Iowa	6	2,297	404	156
Kansas	3	416	208	109
Kentucky	3	1,401	509	12
Louisiana	8	1,210	442	405
Maine	1	688	154	111
Maryland				
Massachusetts				
Michigan	3	1,595	658	132
Minnesota	6	2,981	1,991	1,488
Mississippi	4	1,983	1,021	916
Missouri	1	1,280	295	295
Montana	2	346	287	267
Nebraska	2	45	251	8
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey	3	911	356	305
New Mexico	6	3,053	955	275
New York	22	11,514	2,736	2,341
North Carolina	7	3,615	1,422	1,067
North Dakota	3	8.93	136	65
Ohio	9	3,220	698	391
Oklahoma	4	322	396	316
Oregon	1	164	47	4
Pennsylvania	6	1,895	592	[1] 30
Puerto Rico	20	6,735	3,845	3,053
Rhode Island	2	2,180	324	286
South Carolina	7	2,037	1,118	887
South Dakota	2	545	181	130
Tennessee	6	1,263	599	407
Texas	1	206	72	20
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia	10	6,285	1,615	1,266
Virgin Islands				
Washington	2	524	240	115
West Virginia	22	3,939	1,905	1,864
Wisconsin	9	3,039	1,225	505
Wyoming				
Samoa, American	1	[2]	[2]	[2]
Total	234	97,977	30,278	19,231

[1] State agency (5 schools) now known.
[2] Unknown.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What is the cost of that now?

Mr. DAVIS. We do not have sufficient information yet to give you that figure. We should be able to supply it for the record.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Do you have any idea of what it is?

Mr. DAVIS. My hunch is that it is running about—between 10 and 15 cents a breakfast, Federal money.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is, to enable the school breakfast program being provided to the students; it is for that purpose, is it not?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And what percentage of the students are given a free breakfast and the like?

Mr. DAVIS. The program is designed to operate, first of all, only in very poor schools.

Then, it has been our observation in the last 2 months—the only 2 months of operation—that, primarily, the very poor children are the ones in the schools that have the breakfast program—it appears that only the very poor children are eating that breakfast. There were 27,500 children eating breakfast, and out of that number 19,000 were receiving their breakfast free or for a couple of cents token payment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What are the requirements?

Mr. DAVIS. The requirements——

Mr. ABERNETHY. What do they serve?

Mr. DAVIS. The requirements are for a half-pint of milk, one half-cup of fruit or fruit juice, three quarters of a cup of cereal, in one form or another. We encourage them to add to that protein items such as eggs, sausage, and so on, to the extent that they can.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Now, one other thing, and I am through.

Mr. Secretary, I believe you suggested that consideration was being given to making the school lunch program available during the summer months when the schools are not in session.

Secretary FREEMAN. What I said was that this program would make it possible to reach a number of children who, otherwise, would not have a lunch or any meal on the outside in the absence of a program which might reach them through the medium of organized activity of one kind or another during the summer months. It would not reach all of them, but some of them.

Mr. ABERNETHY. When you say "this program", do you have reference to the school-lunch program?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, I have reference now to the program now pending before this committee, to which I testify today.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The food stamp program, or what?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, to the extension of the Child Nutrition Act, so that there could be a lunch program for the children who are participating in an organized activity by a nonprofit association of some kind or other outside of the school.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Such things as day-care centers, and the like?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is it exactly, settlement houses, and that kind of thing.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not want you to misunderstand me. What about supper? They call it dinner here. Back in the country we call it supper. We have breakfast and we have lunch. Is it anticipated that the Department or somebody—I am not being facetious,

because we have to admit that this is a growing program—maybe it is a fine thing. Do you anticipate that now that we have breakfast and lunch we will soon expand it to include supper?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, we certainly do not, that is, the food stamp program is designed to accomplish this in terms of the family, the family feeding itself.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is all. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hansen.

Mr. HANSEN. On page 11 of your statement, in the second full paragraph you state:

> If a State educational agency cannot see its way clear to undertake administration of this program, the Department of Agriculture will take direct agreements with eligible applicant institutions and supervise their operation under the program.

Would you define exactly what type of institution this would involve?

Secretary FREEMAN. If there is something in the State law which prevents this, or they will not, because they are unwilling to take it on, the responsibility of working with this, let us say maybe with a child care center, why, in that instance if the State does not and will not act, why, then we would be prepared to work directly with that child care center, so that they could have a food program. This is what we do—exactly the same thing as we do now in the school-lunch program.

There are a number of States, because of local laws, where they are unable to administer and supervise and handle it with the local administration of the school-lunch program. If that is the case, why, then, we do it. This is applying to that type of situation.

Mr. HANSEN. You are bypassing the State government, then, if you feel it is a bottleneck?

Secretary FREEMAN. I think "bypassing" is not the word. I suppose that you could use that word, however. That has a certain connotation that you are trying to go around the State government when they do not want you to do so.

The truth of the matter is that these are cases where the State says, in effect, "Would you not do this; we cannot"?

Mr. HANSEN. This is, then, actually done only with the approval and the blessings of the State government?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mr. HANSEN. And where they are unable to act, but they do desire to act?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct—that is correct.

Mr. HANSEN. So this is not a circumvention of the State government in the sense that they do not desire the program and you would then go around them?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, it is not.

Mr. HANSEN. Does this also include the parochial and private schools?

SecretaryFREEMAN. It would, yes.

Mr. HANSEN. Where the State government is not a factor?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HANSEN. On page 9 of your statement, the top of the page, you quote yourself as having earlier said—

> The Administration goal for child nutrition is quite simple. It is to provide every child, regardless of the family's income with access to a complete meal during the day when he or she is away from home.

This will be the school lunch program per se, will it not?

Secretary FREEMAN. This would be the school lunch program during the school year. And this amendment to the Nutrition Act, let us say, during the summer that would give you the possibility. I am sure that you would miss many children—not every child would get a school lunch. It would not be organized outside of the school summer activities, but some would, and those are the ones that would be reached.

Mr. HANSEN. This would be in addition to the breakfast concept?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes. This would fit in with those cases where we have a pilot program now, where children are not getting breakfast before they go to school. We have given those instances that should be made available to them.

Mr. HANSEN. Then, the food stamp program would supplement the school program, so that, in so many words, you would be providing needy children with their breakfast, dinner and supper when this program is finally carried out.

Secretary FREEMAN. It is conceivable in the case of a poor family, that this would be true. There would be a school breakfast program. There would be a school lunch program. That is, if possible. And there would then be the food in the family's evening meal that is in large part the product of the food stamp program.

Mr. HANSEN. How much success have you had with the breakfast program?

Secretary FREEMAN. As was said a moment ago, it is just starting—the first of January—and so it is pretty difficult to say. The response to it has been affirmative. The school authorities have responded to it. States have generally responded to it.

Our early indication would be that it is filling a real unmet need, but we cannot give more than a tentative evaluation of it at this early date. We would hesitate to do other than that.

Mr. HANSEN. I may be partly facetious in what I now ask you, but are we going to do away with mother's home cooking through these programs—are we not doing that?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I think that most of these homes, why, mother's home cooking usually comes in the evening—and she is just going to do as much cooking now as before, but we hope that she will have more to cook with.

Mr. HANSEN. But do you think this will happen?

Secretary FREEMAN. It will not have much to do with mother's home cooking at breakfast time—certainly not in these kinds of areas.

Mr. HANSEN. I recognize that there is a gap in many areas, but I feel that these considerations are important enough to discuss thoroughly.

Secretary FREEMAN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Belcher.

Mr. BELCHER. I agree with the gentleman who has just been praising you, as being interested from a personal standpoint. I understand that he has five children of his own. And I understand that a man can qualify regardless of the amount of his income. So I am saying that he is very vitally interested in this program; is that correct, Mr. Hansen?

Mr. HANSEN. My wife is getting tired of getting up in the morning to get breakfast. [Laughter.]

Mr. BELCHER. Would the gentleman's children be qualified?

Secretary FREEMAN. In this instance we can use Congressman Hansen, who has long been a leader in this field, and who may be suggesting, as a prototype here. I would say no. There would not likely be a breakfast program in the schools to which the Congressman's children would go. At lunch there likely would be a school lunch program that your children would come under—the school lunch program in the schools that your children would go to. The same as the schools to which my children go.

On summer activities it might be possible that some of the children in an area might be in a settlement house area or in some kind of organized activity where they might make food available in the course of the program.

Mr. BELCHER. That would be during the summer months?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes. I figure these possibilities in all seriousness for these children would be on a minor scale. He would not qualify for food stamps, however. [Laughter.]

Mr. BELCHER. It is the Child Nutrition Act that you are talking about?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mr. BELCHER. Under that would it be possible for Mr. Hansen's five children to qualify?

Secretary FREEMAN. If they were going—obviously they would not qualify under need. It is quite specific on that. However, if his children went to a camp for a couple of days with some other friends they had or they went to play basketball at a settlment house in a community nearby, and they had a program going on, it might very well be that all of the children in the area would receive food. It would not be a case where you would line them up and say, "What does your father make—you can have it and you cannot have it." As long as the majority in the area is in a low-income area, all children qualify.

Mr. BELCHER. And in that case the taxpayers would pay for that.

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes. In that case it is possible.

Mr. HANSEN. I would like to set the record straight. It was stated that I have six children, I only have five. I say this so that we do not confuse my people back home. [Laughter.]

Mr. HANSEN. The junior Senator from New York is probably a better example.

Secretary FREEMAN. Are you trying to catch up with him? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. O'Neal.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Secretary, getting back to the food stamp program, as I understand it, apparently a family who has

approximately the same income as the welfare family takes $2 per person and they exchange those $2 for $10 worth of stamps.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is roughly right.

Mr. O'NEAL. That gives them a total of $10 or $12?

Secretary FREEMAN. A total of $12, yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. A total of $12?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is a ratio of about 6 to 1. You take $1 and you get $5 more to go with it to buy groceries.

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. As I understand it, the only limitation on this person, when he goes to the store to buy the food is that he cannot purchase tobacco or alcohol?

Secretary FREEMAN. Or imported items.

Mr. O'NEAL. Or imported items, yes, excuse me. Such as imported sausage and cheese and so forth.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. O'NEAL. So far as seeing that they get a balanced diet, though, there is no supervision over them—that means they can spend it all on potatoes or they can spend it all on vegetables—they do not have to eat a balanced diet if they do not want a balanced diet, do they?

Secretary FREEMAN. There is no requirement to that effect. We are making a very strong effort, primarily through the Extension Service and the extension homemarker to provide nutritional education and training for some of these lower income groups so that they will have more nutritional value.

Mr. O'NEAL. My main concern, Mr. Secretary is whether or not these people are actually buying groceries or whether they buy tobacco and alcohol, because almost invariably in every conversation that I get into with people back home they immediately speak of the abuses in this program with respect to beer and cigarettes. I have discussed this to some extent with Miss Kelley. I just wondered if you had any feeling about whether or not there was much of this going on.

Secretary FREEMAN. It is my information, and I will defer in a moment to Mr. Davis, who administers the program on a day-to-day detailed basis—it is my information and observation since I have talked to people around the country that there has been very little of this kind of abuse.

Mr. O'NEAL. On page 7 it is pretty obvious that you have discovered very little abuse. I see in that paragraph some figures. I added up these figures. And I have also referred to the table attached to your statement.

As of January of this year you had 51,900 stores.

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'NEAL. Across the country. You have apparently investigated only 485 of them. I got that figure by adding up the 239 that you said were found free of any violation and the 189 who simply got a warning letter. There were only 57 stores throughout the entire United States who were punished. And these ranged from just simply disqualifying the store for 30 days in some instances, or up to 1 year in other instances.

I do not know how it is in the city—it may be very easy to discover violations, but I think you will concede that in the rural areas, where you have small grocery stores who sell beer and cigarettes, that it would often be impossible to police this situation, and that you would not get any complaints from those who have participated in the violations themselves; in other words, the customer and the store owner are not ones who would be likely to say anything about this if they were guilty.

I do not know whether you are being a little naive about this situation, or whether I get reports that are exaggerated, but as I said a little ago, throughout my section there is widespread complaint about the fact that some of this 6 to 1 money goes into the purchase of beer.

In connection with the same thing I understood you to say a little while ago that if they were given the money they would play bingo with it. If they were given 6 to 1 money you still do not think that they would buy beer with it?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, I do not think that most of them would. I think that in most of these instances where there is a direct need for food, where the alternatives are to buy beer and cigarettes or to feed the kids, I think that in most instances they are going to feed their kids. My bingo reference——

Mr. O'NEAL. Let me interrupt you at this point. Do you not think that it would be true in those who are eligible for welfare money and who play bingo with it, that they would?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, the bingo reference that I made particularly had to do with some of the old folks. And I made it very sympathetically, because it was my experience as Governor that this happened again and again, that these lonely and bored elderly folks would take a very minor amount of money they had for food and seek some kind of companionship and play bingo with it. I do not recall instances of these kinds of complaints in anything of the same magnitude as on the direct relief money. There will always be some but in this instance the question is you are not going to accomplish perfection, but what will work the best. And I think that perhaps you have received some exaggerated reports. And perhaps I might be a little naive. There are undoubtedly some.

Mr. O'NEAL. There is a possibility.

Secretary FREEMAN. I will concur in that evaluation, but I cannot think of a better way to try to do it. I do not think there is as much as there might seem to be.

Mr. O'NEAL. All I can say is that when I go into the counties where they have the food stamps I have heard many complaints myself.

Secretary FREEMAN. It will be a lot of benefit to check on those complaints and we shall attempt to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Teague.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I believe you testified, Mr. Secretary, that the pilot food program enacted and authorized by Congress in the first year will cost about $4,500,000.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Is this item in the President's budget?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, it is provided for.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. And what is your estimate of the anticipated annual cost after we get beyond the pilot stage—what is your estimate of that cost?

Secretary FREEMAN. It is very, very difficult to estimate it, because we really do not have anything conclusive in terms of how many children, really, will participate in this—how many it actually will reach and so I do not think that we have made any very hard estimate as to where it may lead us until we get something to work with from the pilot experience.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I realize how difficult that would be. You say that you cannot give us any figures.

Secretary FREEMAN. Let me ask my associates here if they have made some estimate. I always get a little nervous about some of these estimates.

Mr. DAVIS. About all we have to go on, Congressman Teague, is the total of numbers of children coming from very poor families. As the Secretary pointed out earlier, there are possibly 1,500,000 preschool children that come from families in very, very low income brackets that might well benefit from group feeding programs designed for them.

We have some figures on the total number of child care centers but this is a very vague figure. You do not know which ones of those are in some sort of operation such as in Chevy Chase or perhaps in a poor neighborhood. Certainly we would want to approach this program very carefully. One of the things that we would be looking at very carefully in the pilot State—one of the things that we will get as a pilot operation would be a better estimate of the possible total magnitude of the program. We would expect, on the basis of the first year's experience to come back to the Congress and share with them our experience and perhaps at that time make a recommendation for the next year's level. This is about the best that we can do at this moment.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I certainly realize the difficulty you have in that respect.

Would you say that it would be unreasonable to expect that this program—this new program—might cost several hundred million dollars a year and before you answer, I do not say that we should either accept or reject it on purely that basis but I do think that we should have some idea of the prospective future cost of the programs before we get into them in the first place.

Mr. DAVIS. I believe, sir, that we testified last year on the prospective breakfast program that for this particular type of program we would not envision it as being a very large program. We think that it would be a very important program in the areas in which they would be eligible for its operation but certainly we would not feel that it would ever run into the hundreds of millions.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dow.

Mr. DOW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In general I support the program, Mr. Secretary, and commend you for a very fine presentation.

My questions are mostly for the purpose of educating myself. They are not controversial, I do not think.

One question is this, is there a variance between the ratio that one family might receive or another in the ratio of what they would have to put into this to receive a given quantity of stamps or a given face value of stamps?

Secretary FREEMAN. There would be some based on the income of the people in a given area, because it would relate to how much they can spend for food, you see. The amount they would have to spend will be greater—the proportion will be greater the more income they have. It will be less the less income they have, because of the amount of the food intake that is being carried through is less, and then there are some that are obviously in complete destitute cases, where there is a very minimal amount.

Mr. DOW. I noticed on page 4 of your statement you state that families' investment in the program represents about 64 percent of the total value of the coupons, but then you speak a little farther down in the statement about a family that invests $2 per person per month, and they in turn would receive about $10 of coupons per month for each member of the family. In other words, the funds are worth more to some people than to others, is that what we are saying?

Secretary FREEMAN. In the $2 that would be the people in the very, very low income level, which is right on rock bottom. As I said, the amount of money that would be taken in in order to get the stamps would be greater as the income of the people went up.

Mr. DOW. In other words, the welfare office would determine this?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct, exactly.

Mr. DOW. Would they be able to reprove a family that was investing heavily in beer and cigarettes—of what he thought their allotment of stamps ought to be—would he reprove them?

Secretary FREEMAN. I doubt that he would probably know that. That might be a factor in his subjective evaluation if he knew the people in the community but, basically, this is on the enforcement side. It would be the people in the store who should know better and who should live up to the law.

Mr. DOW. I have only one more question and that is under the food stamp program apparently the costs are wholly borne by the Federal Government, except for the administrative costs that might be involved at the state level.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DOW. Or the local level.

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOW. Under the nutrition program, I was not too clear—and maybe you have some idea, Mr. Secretary, on this, do the state and the local people contribute or does the institution contribute in part some of the cost of the food provided under this program?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes. You see, this is related to the school lunch approach. And the amount that the Federal Government puts in is more than matched by the local school district in the normal course of events except in those cases where we are dealing with children in the very low income groups that cannot afford to pay for any lunch, and in those instances we go up to 80 percent, but generally the pattern is that we have a very considerable local contribution which is made as well.

Mr. Dow. Would the state participate?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes. In most of these. Well, it would depend upon the instances, referring again to the school lunch program, the States do participate and some quite heavily.

Mr. Dow. And they might in this?

Secretary FREEMAN. And they might in that; that is correct.

Mr. Dow. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wampler.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Secretary, I have received a number of letters from constituents who feel that they have been wrongfully denied certification for food stamps. Could yon give me, a Member of Congress, some guidance as to whom I should turn for help in these cases?

Secretary FREEMAN. I think that in this instance you will have to go to the local public welfare authorities, perhaps of the State, to see if the State standards are being met by the local authorities or whoever does the certification, that there is a certification that operates according to the standards set down by the Congress. That is the extent of our involvement in that. And that Mr. Jones and Mr. Smith do not qualify is something that would be determined by the local welfare authorities.

Mr. WAMPLER. You feel that it would be proper for me, as a Member of Congress, to make an inquiry of the State and the local office on that?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WAMPLER. Does the Department of Agriculture make any part of the payment toward the administrative costs of the food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. No.

Mr. WAMPLER. How many people in the Department of Agriculture work in the food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. Excuse me. I will correct this. That is, to be sure the record is right. To the extent that some now have a small margin of nonpublic welfare cases that might be certified, that would run out of the local welfare area, we would provide some administrative costs assistance, but it is fairly nominal in amount.

Mr. WAMPLER. The other question was how many people in the Department of Agriculture work in the food stamp program.

Secretary FREEMAN. How many?

Miss KELLEY. At the end of this fiscal year, Congressman Wampler, we will have 875 projects in operation. There will be a total of 831 or somewhat less in number than one man-year per project area for the complete Federal administration.

Mr. WAMPLER. I believe, Mr. Secretary, you said the commercial banks receive no payment from the Federal Government for the service of redeeming the coupons that the wholesalers and the retailers deposited with them.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. WAMPLER. In those States which have adopted the policy of permitting the commercial banks to issue the coupons, do those banks receive any fee for issuing them?

Secretary FREEMAN. If they do, the fee comes from the State or the locality that handles it. How the stamps get to the people is a local responsibility and financing.

Mr. WAMPLER. In response to the quiry by Mr. Abernethy your answer was that you would supply for the record as nearly as you had them both the Federal administrative cost and what the local costs were.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. WAMPLER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Jones, may I say before you start that there are two more witnesses present and that there are two more members who have asked to be recognized to ask questions.

I want the members to know this situation and to be governed accordingly.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. This problem does not exist nationwide, but I think it is typical of our part of the country. You have referred, I believe, Mr. Davis, to poor schools, which I take it is a unit composed of x percentage of enrollment from families under certain income groups.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Let us say that it is 50 percent—what is your figure?

Mr. DAVIS. We have no hard and fast figure on that.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. For the sake of argument let us say that it is 50 percent. When we come to a school which does not qualify as a poor school, as being qualified as a recipient of these Federal assistance programs, but in this school, which does not qualify as a poor school, we have kids, that is, 15 percent of the individual students, who are from families that would qualify if they were in the so-called poor school.

I find in your program, as well as in many of the HEW programs, that this percentage of needy families or of needy children are being penalized by attending a school which does not qualify under that definition.

Has there been any thought given to that or any action taken toward directing this aid on the individual basis rather than on the per-school enrollment basis?

Secretary FREEMAN. First of all, there is a provision under the Child Nutrition Act to help a school which has not been able to develop a school lunch program because it was limited in its resources. Equipment can be made available and they may have special assistance so that the situation would not exist, find special funding for such a school, because the children cannot afford to buy the lunch as they would put it in a school district where these children are better off.

Presumably under this, if it works as we hope it will, the school lunch program will (a) reach school districts that have not had the program before, and (b) reach those who could not afford to pay anything for lunch before. And this is the purpose of the Child Nutrition Act.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Regardless of the per capita income of the school—it would be subject to the situation of the individual child?

Secretary FREEMAN. You have a school lunch program where children cannot afford to pay for the lunch and should get it free. That is the way that the School Lunch Act has read from the very beginning. So the problem has been as a practical matter that the local schools have not done it because they have not had enough money. So what they have said, in effect, is that—

> If we have to give this free to some students, we would have to cut back our program so that it would not be a workable program, but it is well to do the very best we can, we will get the cost as low as we can for everyone, but everyone will have to pay 25 cents—we cannot let some pay 10 cents and some pay nothing.

Under the Child Nutrition Act, not adequately funded yet but hopefully the time will come that in those instances where the child cannot afford to pay he will get the lunch and that school will be able, in effect, to do what they were supposed to do from the very beginning.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. May.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Secretary, on page 6 of your statement you point out how the program has been administered under the Food Stamp Act. You state:

> The state welfare group—through its local counterpart offices—must assume responsibility for the certification of households. The act requires that these certification functions be carried out under the same general procedures and merit system personnel centers used in the certification of recipients of public assistance.

I realize that there has been some discussion of this point earlier this morning. However, I would like to say that if there has been an area in which I have had criticism from various States it is on the differentation of criterion in certification. Has this been a problem in the administration of this program from the viewpoint of administration?

Secretary FREEMAN. I will defer to Mr. Davis to answer that.

Mr. DAVIS. I think that on the whole we have had to spend a great deal of effort with the local welfare people to explain the special concern in certifying for the program that they might not necessarily have in their own programs.

For example, in determining the income for the basis of the purchase requirement, we need them to find out as nearly as they can the exact income, not that it is just below the eligibility level but how much it is.

Secondly, we have tried to build into this program several flexibilities that will enable the caseworker to tailor the program to the individual—such things as excessive medical expense, such things as excessive rent which the caseworker might not ordinarily taken into account in her normal work with poor families. So that there are certain different things that the caseworker must do in interviewing the food stamp participant that she might no necessarily do with other families.

To the extent that the caseworkers can apply these flexibilities, the program can be more successful for the individual family. For example, one family with an income of $100 is paying $50 rent and will not have much money left for food as compared to another family

with $100 income which is only paying $30 for rent. We have some flexibility that they can apply and to the extent that they can the program is more successful. And this I think is probably what you have been hearing about.

Mrs. MAY. Yes. My question then would be about the State authorities or the local authorities. Are they being responsive to the criteria that you point out that should be met, whether it is a really sound controlling certification—too much money being spent or an overrigid certification or standards—are they responsive at that point?

Mr. DAVIS. On the whole I would say that they have been most responsive. And here again the better our communication down to the individual caseworkers the better the response has been—where they understand the program and what it is designed to do and not designed to do. There is a growing feeling, as you may be aware of, among the caseworkers across the country that they are overburdened with both the caseload and the paperwork. This program adds an additional job. To that extent there has been a little grumbling here and there, but I say that by and large the welfare people down to the caseworkers across the country have been most responsive except where they feel that since this is Federal money that we ought to just give it to the people without asking too many questions, whereas they might not do that with their own State's money. Generally it has been very good.

Mrs. MAY. You have to get that cooperation; that is, the cooperation of the local people to work with the program.

Mr. DAVIS. Of course that is correct.

Mrs. MAY. In that respect, what can you do to get that cooperation?

Mr. DAVIS. First we try to straighten out the situation by reasoning. In the last analysis the State is financially liable for negligence in certifying each family, so that they could well find themselves, if they just decided that they were not going to do a good job and were not going to take the trouble to do it, that we would have that final recourse of a claim against them for any poor certification.

Mrs. MAY. Have you had so far to use that authority?

Mr. DAVIS. We have not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would you yield to me?

Mrs. MAY. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. This paper that I have here, attached to your statement, entitled "Food Stamp Program, Select Program Statistics for Specified Months," does that show all of the counties that are on the food stamp program and the number of people who are receiving stamps?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. In January of this year for that month.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I wish that we could have the Secretary or Mr. Davis furnish the committee—and I would like to have a copy of it as soon as I can get it—of the names of the counties of the United States now receiving commodities for distribution.

The CHAIRMAN. You will supply that for the record?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

(The information follows:)

AREAS OPERATING A COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FOR NEEDY FAMILIES IN JANUARY 1967

Alabama

Bibb
Blount
Calhoun
Cherokee
Cleburne
Coffee
Colbert
Conecuh
Cullman
Dale
Dallas
De Kalb
Etowah
Fayette
Franklin
Geneva
Jackson
Lamar
Lauderdale
Lawrence
Limestone
Macon
Madison
Marion
Marshall
St. Clair
Shelby
Talladega
Winston

Alaska

None

Arizona

Apache
Cochise
Coconino
Gila
Graham
Greenlee
Maricopa
Mohave
Navajo
Pima
Pinal
Santa Cruz
Yavapai
Yuma
Navajo Reservation

Arkansas

Baxter
Benton
Boone
Calhoun
Carroll
Chicot
Clark
Clay
Cleburne
Cleveland
Columbia
Crawford
Cross
Dallas
Desha
Franklin
Fulton
Garland
Grant
Greene
Hot Spring
Howard
Jackson
Johnson
Lafayette
Lawrence
Little River
Logan
Madison
Marion
Montgomery
Nevada
Newton
Ouachita
Pike
Poinsett
Polk
Pope
Randolph
Saline
Scott
Searcy
Sebastian
Sharp
Stone
Union
Van Buren
Washington
White
Woodruff
Yell

California

Amador
Colusa
El Dorado
Fresno
Inyo
Kern
Kings
Madera
Mendocino
Merced
Modoc
Plumas
Sacramento
San Joaquin
San Luis Obispo
San Barbara
Santa Cruz
Shasta
Siskiyou
Stanislaus
Sutter
Tehama
Tulare
Tuolumne
Ventura
Yolo
Yuba
Calexico (city)

Colorado

Archuleta
Bent
Chaffee
Cheyenne
Dolores
El Paso
Fremont
Grand
Gunnison
Kit Carson
Lake
LaPlata
Lincoln
Logan
Montezuma
Montrose
Morgan
Phillips
Prowers
Routt
Saguache
San Miguel
Sedgwick
Teller
Washington
Yuma
Hartford (city)
Hebron (city)
Plainfield (city)
Putnam (city)
Thompson (city)
Torrington (city)
Windsor-Locks (city)

Delaware

Kent
New Castle
Sussex

District of Columbia

None

Florida

Baker
Bay
Bradford
Broward
Dade
Dixie
Duval
Escambia

AREAS OPERATING A COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FOR NEEDY FAMILIES IN JANUARY 1967—Continued

Florida—Continued

Gadsden
Hardee
Highlands
Hillsborough
Lafayette
Lake
Lee
Leon
Monroe
Okeechobee
Palm Beach
Pasco
Pinellas
Polk
Santa Rosa
Taylor
Union
Cuban Refugee Assistance (city)
Seminole Indian (city)

Georgia

Atkinson
Bacon
Baker
Banks
Barrow
Bartow
Berrien
Bleckley
Brantley
Brooks
Bryan
Butts
Camden
Chattahoochee
Chattooga
Cherokee
Clarke
Clay
Clayton
Cobb
Coffee
Cook
Crisp
Dade
De Kalb
Dooly
Douglas
Early
Fannin
Floyd
Fulton
Glynn
Greene
Gwinnett
Habersham
Henry
Jackson
Jeff Davis
Jefferson
Liberty
Long
McIntosh
Macon
Marion
Miller
Monroe
Muscogee
Newton
Pierce
Quitman
Randolph
Rockdale
Screven
Spalding
Stewart
Tattnall
Taylor
Telfair
Terrell
Walker
Ware
Wayne
Whitfield
Worth

Hawaii

None

Idaho

Benewah
Bonner
Boundary
Clearwater
Idaho
Kootenai
Latah
Lemhi
Lewis
Nez Perce
Shoshone
Fort Hall Indian Reservation

Illinois

Adams
Brown
Carroll
Cass
Champaign
Christian
Clark
Cumberland
De Witt
Douglas
Edgar
Effingham
Ford
Fulton
Grundy
Hancock
Henderson
Henry
Jo Daviess
Kane
Kankakee
Knox
La Salle
Lee
Liningston
Logan
McDonough
McHenry
Macon
Marshall
Mason
Mercer
Morgan
Moultrie
Ogle
Peoria
Piatt
Pike
Rock Island
Sangamon
Schuyler
Scott
Shelby
Tazewell
Vermilion
Warren
Whiteside
Will
Winnebago
Woodford

Indiana

Adams
Allen
Benton
Blackford
Boone
Brown
Carroll
Cass
Clark
Clay
Clinton
Crawford
Daviess
Dearborn
Decatur
De Kalb
Delaware
Dubois
Elkhart
Fayette
Fountain
Franklin
Fulton
Grant
Greene
Hamilton
Hancock

AREAS OPERATING A COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FOR NEEDY FAMILIES IN JANUARY 1967—Continued

Indiana—Continued

Hendricks
Henry
Howard
Huntington
Jackson
Jasper
Jay
Jefferson
Jennings
Johnson
Kosciusko
Lagrange
La Porte
Lawrence
Marshall
Martin
Miami
Monroe
Montgomery
Morgan
Noble
Ohio
Orange
Owen
Parke
Porter
Pulaski
Randolph
Ripley
Rush
St. Joseph
Scott
Shelby
Starke
Sullivan
Tippecanoe
Union
Vermillion
Vigo
Wabash
Warren
Washington
Wayne
Wells
Whitley

Iowa

Audubon
Black Hawk
Boone
Buchanan
Buena Vista
Carroll
Cass
Cedar
Cherokee
Chickasaw
Clay
Clinton
Crawford
Dickinson
Floyd
Fremont
Hancock
Howard
Humboldt
Iowa
Jackson
Jones
Keokuk
Kossuth
Linn
Louisa
Mahaska
Marion
Mitchell
Monroe
Muscatine
Osceola
Palo Alto
Pocahontas
Polk
Pottawattamie
Sac
Shelby
Story
Webster
Winnebaga
Winneshiek
Wright

Kansas

Clark
Elk
Ford
Grant
Hamilton
Harper
Hodgeman
Kearny
Kingman
Meade
Phillips
Sedgwick
Shawnee
Sherman
Wyandotte

Kentucky

Anderson
Ballard
Barren
Boone
Boyd
Boyle
Bracken
Breckinridge
Bullitt
Butler
Caldwell
Calloway
Carlisle
Carroll
Christian
Crittenden
Daviess
Edmonson
Fayette
Fleming
Franklin
Fulton
Garrard
Grant
Graves
Grayson
Green
Greenup
Hancock
Hardin
Hart
Henderson
Henry
Hickman
Hopkins
Jessamine
Kenton
Larue
Lawrence
Lewis
Livingston
Lyon
McCracken
McLean
Madison
Marion
Marshall
Mason
Meade
Mercer
Metcalfe
Monroe
Nelson
Ohio
Oldham
Owen
Pendleton
Powell
Robertson
Rowan
Scott
Shelby
Spencer
Taylor
Trigg
Trimble
Union
Warren
Washington
Webster

Louisiana

Allen
Ascension
Catahoula
East Carroll
Grant

AREAS OPERATING A COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FOR NEEDY FAMILIES IN JANUARY 1967—Continued

Louisiana—Continued

La Salle
Madison
St. Bernard
St. Charles
St. Mary
Tensas
West Baton Rouge

Maine

Aroostook
Cumberland
Franklin
Hancock
Kennebec
Knox
Lincoln
Oxford
Penobscot
Piscataquis
Sagadahoc
Somerset
Waldo
Washington
York

Maryland

Hartford
Somerset
Baltimore (City)

Massachusetts (cities)

Amherst
Boston
Brockton
Buckland
Cambridge
Chicopee
Deerfield
Easthampton
Gardner
Goshen
Lowell
Lynnfield
Malden
New Bedford
Northampton
Petersham
Phillipston
Quincy
Royalston
Springfield
Templeton
West Springfield
Williamsburg
Winchendon

Michigan

Alcona
Alger
Allegan
Alpena
Antrim
Arenac
Baraga
Barry
Bay
Benzie
Berrien
Branch
Calhoun
Cass
Charlevoix
Cheboygan
Chippewa
Clare
Clinton
Crawford
Delta
Dickinson
Eaton
Emmet
Genesee
Galdwin
Grand Traverse
Gratiot
Hillsdale
Huron
Ingham
Ionia
Iosco
Iron
Isabella
Jackson
Kalamazoo
Kalkaska
Kent
Keweenaw
Lake
Lapeer
Leelanau
Lenawee
Livingston
Luce
Mackinac
Manistee
Marquette
Mason
Mecosta
Menominee
Midland
Missaukee
Monroe
Montcalm
Montmorency
Muskegon
Newaygo
Oceana
Ogemaw
Ontonagon
Osceola
Oscoda
Otsego
Ottawa
Presque Isle
Roscommon
Saginaw
St. Joseph
Sanilac
Schoolcraft
Shiawassee
Tuscola
Van Buren
Washtenaw
Wexford

Minnesota

Blue Earth
Carver
Cass
Chisago
Clearwater
Cook
Cottonwood
Douglas
Faribault
Grant
Isanti
Jackson
Kanabec
Kittson
Lake of the Woods
Le Sueur
Lyon
Mahnomen
Marshall
Meeker
Mille Lacs
Morrison
Mower
Murray
Nicollet
Pennington
Pope
Red Lake
Rock
Scott
Sherburne
Sibley
Stevens
Todd
Traverse
Wadena
Waseca
Yellow Medicine
Red Lake Indian Reservation
Lower Sioux Community Indian Reservation

Mississippi

Adams
Alcorn
Amite
Benton
Bolivar
Calhoun

AREAS OPERATING A COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FOR NEEDY FAMILIES IN JANUARY 1967—Continued

Mississippi—Continued

Carroll
Choctaw
Claiborne
Clarke
Copiah
Covington
De Soto
Franklin
George
Greene
Grenada
Hancock
Hinds
Holmes
Humphreys
Issaquena
Itawamba
Jackson
Jasper
Jefferson
Jefferson Davis
Kemper
Lafayette
Lamar
Lauderdale
Lawrence
Leake
Leflore
Lincoln
Marshall
Monroe
Montgomery
Neshoba
Newton
Noxubee
Oktibbeha
Pearl River
Perry
Pontotoc
Prentiss
Quitman
Rankin
Scott
Sharkey
Simpson
Smith
Stone
Sunflower
Tallahatchie
Tate
Tippah
Tishomingo
Tunica
Union
Walthall
Warren
Washington
Wayne
Webster
Wilkinson
Winston
Yalobusha
Indina Agency

Missouri

Buchanan
Butler
Cape Girardeau
Carter
Clay
Daviess
De Kalb
Dunklin
Gentry
Greene
Iron
Jackson
Jefferson
Linn
Livingston
Mercer
Mississippi
New Madrid
Nodaway
Pemiscot
Perry
Reynolds
Ripley
St. Charles
St. Francois
St. Louis
Scott
Stoddard
Washington
Wayne

Montana

Flathead
Glacier
Roosevelt
Tribal Councils:
Crow Indian
Fort Belknap
Northern Cheyenne
Rocky Boy
Salish and Kootenai

Nebraska

Winnebago Indian Agency

Nevada

Clark
Elko
Eureka
Humboldt
Lincoln
Mineral
Ormsby
Pershing
White Pine

New Hampshire

Belknap
Carroll
Cheshire
Coos
Grafton
Hillsborough
Merrimack
Rockingham
Strafford
Sullivan

New Jersey

Asbury Park (city)
Alpha (city)
Bayonne (city)
Cumberland (city)
Estelle Manor (city)
Franklin (city)
Garfield (city)
Glassboro (city)
Hamilton Township
Howell Township
Jackson Township
Jersey City
Keyport (city)
Lakewood (city)
Little Egg Harbor (city)
Millstone (city)
Monroe (city)
Mt. Holly (city)
Mt. Laurel (city)
Newark (city)
N. Shrewsbury (city)
N. Hanover (city)
Phillipsburg (city)
Pohotcong (city)
S. Brunswick (city)
Wanaque
Washington

New Mexico

Bernalillo
Catron
De Baca
Dona Ana
Grant
Guadalupe
Hidalgo
Lincoln
Luna
McKinley
Otero
San Juan
Sierra
Socorro
Torrance
Valencia

New York

Albany
Allegany
Broome
Cattaraugus
Cayuga
Chautauqua

AREAS OPERATING A COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FOR NEEDY FAMILIES IN JANUARY 1967—Continued

New York—Continued

Chemung
Clinton
Columbia
Cortland
Delaware
Essex
Franklin
Fulton
Genesee
Greene
Hamilton
Herkimer
Jefferson
Lewis
Livingston
Madison
Monroe
Montgomery
Nassau
Niagara
Oneida
Onondaga
Ontario
Orleans
Oswego
Rensselaer
St. Lawrence
Saratoga
Schenectady
Schoharie
Schuyler
Seneca
Steuben
Suffolk
Tioga
Tompkins
Ulster
Warren
Washington
Wayne
Westchester
Wyoming
Yates
Auburn (city)
Binghamton (city)
Jamestown (city)
Oswego (city)
Union (city)
New York (city)

North Carolina

Alamance
Alexander
Alleghany
Anson
Ashe
Avery
Beaufort
Brunswick
Burke
Caldwell
Camden
Carteret
Cherokee
Clay
Columbus
Craven
Cumberland
Davidson
Davie
Edgecombe
Gaston
Gates
Graham
Greene
Guilford
Henderson
Hertford
Hoke
Hyde
Jackson
Johnston
Jones
Lenoir
McDowell
Macon
Madison
Mecklenburg
Mitchell
Montgomery
Onslow
Pamlico
Pasquotank
Perquimans
Pitt
Richmond
Robeson
Rockingham
Rowan
Rutherford
Swain
Transylvania
Tyrrell
Vance
Wake
Warren
Washington
Watauga
Wayne
Wilkes
Wilson
Yadkin
Yancey

North Dakota

Burleigh
Cass
Dunn
Foster
Grand Forks
McHenry
Oliver
Pembina
Pierce
Ramsey
Rolette
Sheridan
Stark
Walsh
Ward
Williams
Indian Agencies:
Fort Berthold
Fort Totten
Turtle Mountain
Standing Rock

Ohio

Adams
Ashtabula
Belmont
Brown
Butler
Champaign
Clinton
Crawford
Darke
Fayette
Geauga
Guernsey
Highland
Hocking
Jackson
Knox
Licking
Madison
Marion
Miami
Monroe
Morrow
Muskingum
Ottawa
Perry
Pickaway
Pike
Portage
Preble
Shelby
Union
Vinton
Warren

Oklahoma

Adair
Alfalfa
Atoka
Beckham
Blaine
Bryan
Caddo
Canadian
Carter
Cherokee
Choctaw
Cimarron
Cleveland

AREAS OPERATING A COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FOR NEEDY FAMILIES IN JANUARY 1967—Continued

Oklahoma—Continued

Coal
Comanche
Cotton
Craig
Creek
Custer
Delaware
Dewey
Ellis
Garfield
Garvin
Grady
Grant
Greer
Harmon
Harper
Haskell
Hughes
Jackson
Jefferson
Johnston
Kay
Kingfisher
Kiowa
Latimer
Le Flore
Lincoln
Logan
Love
McClain
McCurtain
McIntosh
Marshall
Mayes
Murray
Muskogee
Noble
Nowata
Okfuskee
Oklahoma
Okmulgee
Osage
Ottawa
Pawnee
Payne
Pittsburg
Pontotoc
Pottawatomie
Pushmataha
Roger Mills
Rogers
Seminole
Sequoyah
Stephens
Tillman
Tulsa
Wagoner
Washington
Washita
Woodward

Oregon

Baker
Benton
Clackamas
Clatsop
Columbia
Coos
Crook
Curry
Deschutes
Douglas
Gilliam
Grant
Harney
Hood River
Jackson
Jefferson
Josephine
Klamath
Lake
Lane
Lincoln
Linn
Malheur
Marion
Morrow
Polk
Sherman
Umatilla
Union
Wasco
Wheeler
Yamhill

Pennsylvania

Armstrong
Beaver
Bedford
Berks
Blair
Bucks
Butler
Cameron
Carbon
Centre
Chester
Clarion
Columbia
Crawford
Cumberland
Delaware
Elk
Erie
Forest
Franklin
Fulton
Jefferson
Lancaster
Lawrence
Lebanon
Lehigh
Lycoming
Mercer
Monroe
Montgomery
Montour
Northampton
Schuylkill
Snyder
Union
Venango
Warren
Wayne
Westmoreland
York

Puerto Rico

Adjuntas
Aguada
Aguadilla
Aguas Buenas
Aibonito
Anasco
Arecibo
Arroyo
Barceloneta
Barranquitas
Bayamon
Cabo Rojo
Caguas
Camuy
Carolina
Castaner
Catano
Cayey
Ceiba
Ciales
Cidra
Coamo
Comerio
Corozal
Dorado
Fajardo
Guanica
Guayama
Guayanilla
Guaynabo
Gurabo
Hatillo
Hormigueros
Humacao
Isabela
Jayuya
Juana Diaz
Juncos
Lajas
Lares
Las Marias
Las Piedras
Loiza
Luquillo

AREAS OPERATING A COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FOR NEEDY FAMILIES IN JANUARY 1967—Continued

Puerto Rico—Continued

Manati
Maricao
Maunabo
Mayaguez
Moca
Morovis
Naguabo
Naranjito
Orocovis
Patillas
Penuelas
Ponce I
Ponce II
Quebradillas
Ricon
Rio Grande
Rio Piedras
Sabana Grande
Salinas
San German
San Juan I
San Juan II
San Lorenzo
San Sebastian
Santa Isabel
Toa Alta
Toa Baja
Trujillo Alto
Utuado
Vega Alta
Vega Baja
Vieques
Villalba
Yabucoa
Yauco

Rhode Island (cities)

Bristol
Burrillville
Coventry
Cranston
East Greenwich
Foster
Glocester
Jamestown
Johnston
Lincoln
N. Providence
N. Smithfield
Smithfield
Warren
Warwick
West Greenwich
West Warwick

South Carolina

None

South Dakota

Aurora
Beadle
Bennett
Brown
Brule
Buffalo
Clark
Codington
Corson
Davison
Edmunds
Faulk
Grant
Hand
Hanson
Hutchinson
Hyde
Jackson
Jerauld
Lyman
McCook
McPherson
Marshall
Mellette
Miner
Pennington
Perkins
Potter
Roberts
Sanborn
Spink
Todd
Tripp
Union Walworth
Indian reservatives:
Cheyenne
Crow Creek
Lower Brule
Pine Ridge
Rosebud
Sisseton
Yanton

Tennessee

Benton
Blount
Carroll
Carter
Clay
Cumberland
Decatur
Greene
Hamblen
Hawkins
Henderson
Loudon
Madison
Obion
Overton
Perry
Putnam
Rhea
Roane
Sullivan
Unicoi
Union
Washington
Wayne
White

Texas

Anderson
Angelina
Bee
Brooks
Brown
Callahan
Cameron
Camp
Carson
Childress
Cochran
Coke
Cooke
Cottle
Crosby
Dallam
Dallas
Dawson
Dickens
Duval
Eastland
Fisher
Floyd
Foard
Franklin
Galveston
Grimes
Guadalupe
Hale
Hardeman
Hardin
Harris
Haskell
Hemphill
Henderson
Hidalgo
Hockley
Howard
Hudspeth
Hutchinson
Irion
Jackson
Jefferson
Jim Hogg
Jim Wells
Jones
Kent
Kinney
Kleberg
Knox
Lamb
Liberty
Lipscomb
Lubbock
McLennan
Martin

AREAS OPERATING A COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FOR NEEDY FAMILIES IN JANUARY 1967—Continued

Texas—Continued

Matagorda
Maverick
Milam
Montague
Moore
Morris
Motley
Newton
Nolan
Nueces
Orange
Polk
Potter
Red River
Sabine
San Augustine
San Jacinto
San Patricio
Scurry
Shelby
Smith
Starr
Stonewall
Swisher
Terry
Titus
Tom Green
Travis
Trinity
Upshur
Webb
Wilbarger
Zapata
Crystal (city)
Denison (city)
San Antonio (city)

Trust territory

None

Utah

Grand
Salt Lake
San Juan
Summit
Tooele
Uintah
Wasatch

Vermont

Addison
Bennington
Caledonia
Chittenden
Essex
Orange
Orleans
Rutland
Washington
Windham
Windsor

Virginia

Buchanan
Giles
Russell
Scott
Roanoke (city)
Bethlehem

Virgin Islands (cities)

Christiansted
Coral Bay
Cruz Bay
Frederiksted
Grove Place
Korea
Profit
St. Thomas

Washington

Chelan
Douglas
Ferry
Grant
Island
King
Kittitas
Okanogan
Pend Oreille
Pierce
San Juan
Skagit
Snohomish
Spokane
Stevens
Whatcom

West Virginia

Berkeley
Brooke
Grant
Hampshire
Hancock
Hardy
Jefferson
Marshall
Mineral
Morgan
Ohio
Pleasants
Ritchie
Tyler
Wetzel

Wisconsin

Adams
Ashland
Barron
Bayfield
Brown
Buffalo
Clark
Dane
Dodge
Florence
Fond du Lac
Forest
Jackson
Juneau
Kenosha
LaCrosse
Lincoln
Manitowoc
Marathon
Marinette
Menomonee
Monroe
Oconto
Outagamie
Ozaukee
Polk
Portage
Racine
Rock
Sauk
Sawyer
Shawano
Sheboygan
Taylor
Washburn
Washington
Waupaca
Waushara
Winnebago
Wood
Arthur (city)
Birch Creek (city)
Cadott (city)
Chippewa Falls (city)
Cleveland (city)
Colburn (city)
Cornell (city)
Eagle Point (city)
Estelle (city)
Fairchild (village)
Fairchild (town)
New Holcombe (city)
New Auburn (city)
Ruby (city)
Sampson (city)
Stanley (city)
Wilson (city)
Indian Tribal Council of Lac du Flambeau

Wyoming

Wind River Indian Reservation

Mrs. MAY. You have pointed out that there are three ways that you make the coupons available, through the local offices, the State government and the banks. Are you reimbursing the banks for doing this work? There is, of course, some work to the bank, some cost to them in handling the coupons. Do you reimburse them?

Mr. DAVIS. We do not. The Federal Government does not. Where the State elects to hire a bank, to use a bank as its agent in selling the coupons, they negotiate a contract with that bank and establish the cost per transaction. And the locality pays it.

Mrs. MAY. In other words, do you have any instances where the cost of the bank to the State is passed on?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, quite often these pass on down to the local community.

Mrs. MAY. So far what has been your experience, which of these methods are being used mainly to distribute coupons? Is it through the local governments or do they use a bank or what?

Miss KELLEY. It is done mostly by the State or local governments. There are a number of local governments and State governments that have felt that a contract with the bank might do two things—provide more service to the recipient and perhaps actually be a cheaper method to the State than to establish and hire and have accountability control, but the banks are the lesser of the two used at the moment.

Mrs. MAY. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mrs. May.

I would call the attention of the members of the committee that Mrs. Sullivan, the author of the bill placed into the Congressional Record at page A–1278 through A–1286 an explanation of this program that I think all of you might find worthwhile reading to get a factual understanding of the background of the program.

Mrs. Sullivan will be heard before the committee tomorrow morning. We have two more witnesses scheduled today.

If there are no further questions of the Secretary, we will proceed with the other witnesses.

We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Secretary, and to your associates for the explanation you have given us.

We will hear from Mr. Patrick B. Healy, assistant secretary of the National Milk Producers Federation. We are glad to have you to present your views to us, Mr. Healy. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF PATRICK B. HEALY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the National Milk Producers Federation is a national farm organization. It represents dairy farmers and the dairy cooperative associations which they own and operate. Through their cooperatives, dairy farmers act together to process and market, on a cost basis, the milk and butterfat produced on their farms.

The federation for many years maintained a position in favor of a food stamp plan. Such a plan would permit our agricultural abun-

dance to be used for the benefit of the nation as a whole by providing better nutrition for groups not economically able to provide adequate nutrition for themselves.

We, therefore, remain in general support of the food stamp plan.

Instead of storing surplus dairy products, with attendant storage costs, we believe these products should be moved out into consumption.

The food stamp plan allows for us to distribute commodities before they accumulate in the Commodity Credit Corporation warehouses as surplus.

It was on this same basis that we supported also the direct relief distribution programs of the Department of Agriculture.

The Food Stamp Act of 1964 creates a conflict between these two programs, both of which we believe are beneficial and both of which we believe should be retained and permitted to operate side by side.

The conflict arises in subsection (b) of section 4 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964. This subsection provides that, except in emergency cases, there can be no distribution of federally owned foods to households in areas where a good stamp program is in effect.

The bill introduced by Representative Sisk, H.R. 1268, would repeal the restriction on the use of direct distribution programs in areas where food stamp programs are in effect.

We support and endorse H.R. 1268.

If the Food Stamp Act is amended to repeal this inconsistency between the two programs, we would then favor its extension beyond June 30, 1967, by amendment of section 16(a) to authorize appropriation beyond that date.

Our purpose in appearing here today, Mr. Chairman, on these bills before the committee is to make provision against this specter of surpluses which we are constantly aware of. We harken back to the statements made by Mr. Brasco and Mr. Abernethy and believe that a provision should be made for the Secretary to have the authority to distribute the surplus commodities if and when they develop in his charge.

I believe unless we are able to do something about the unconscionable flood of import products which are coming into this country in clear evasion of current law that we are going to be plagued with tremendous surpluses of milk which will have to be collected by the Commodity Credit Corporation. So we want to amend this food stamp plan to allow for the use of these commodities if and when they develop.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Healy.

Are there any questions of Mr. Healy. If there are no questions, we are very much obliged to you for your statement.

We will now hear from Mr. George A. Wiley, who is director of the poverty rights action center, office of the national headquarters, welfare rights organization, who is accompanied by Carl Rachlin, general counsel; and Mrs. Etta Horn, national vice chairman.

We shall be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Wiley.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE A. WILEY, DIRECTOR, POVERTY RIGHTS ACTION CENTER, OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, WELFARE RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS; ACCOMPANIED BY CARL RACHLIN, GENERAL COUNSEL; AND MRS. ETTA HORN, NATIONAL VICE CHAIRMAN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is George Wiley. I am director of the poverty rights action center in Washington, D.C., which is the national headquarters for welfare recipient organizations across the country.

With me are Mrs. Etta Horn, vice chairman of the national coordinating committee of welfare rights groups, and a welfare recipient who participates in the food stamp program here in the District of Columbia; and Mr. Carl Rachlin of the scholarship education and defense fund for racial equality, who serves as general counsel to our organization.

The national welfare rights movement is a federation of over 200 welfare rights organizations from 26 States and more than 70 communities. A list of the welfare rights groups and the brief history of the welfare rights movement is appended for your information.

I shall not read the entire testimony, of which you have a copy before you, but would like to call attention to some of the high points of the concern that the welfare recipients have with the administration and the operation of the food stamp program and to suggest some kinds of changes that might be made to make the program more beneficial to the welfare recipients.

I would submit that the program has been developed especially with no consultation or consideration of the needs or the interests or the problems that the programs cause to welfare recipients and to low income families who wish to participate in the programs.

The most fundamental and universal complaint of the recipients of these programs is the fact that they are required in order to participate to invest more of their very limited income and budget into the purchase of food stamps which is then restricted actually to a single purpose use.

The problems that are presented by this are many. Anybody who has operated a household knows that these are problems that one has, particularly with a limited budget trying to juggle expenditures and trying to balance the needs that a family has; particularly I would like to point out that many of these expenditures that the low-income people have are such as fixed rents and transportation costs and the cost of utilities and other items that are essentially required to be purchased on a regular basis. And the freezing of a large segment, a large additional segment of a very limited budget, normally works very great hardship on the families that are involved. And it is little consolation that you are well fed if your children do not have clothing or shoes to wear to school or such items as that which are essential to the needs of a family under these conditions.

We believe that the program could be restructured so that some of these problems could be alleviated if due consideration were given to the needs of the recipients.

Further on I would simply like to point out that the procedures that are used by the Department of Agriculture in arriving at the amounts that people have to invest in food stamps are relatively arbitrary and based on standards that are arrived at apart from the individual needs frequently apart from the needs that could be identified with a particular case.

I would cite the case of the problem encountered by an urban family living in an area—let us say New York State, or Illinois, or some place where there are large metropolitan concentrations and the rural family where the food budget estimate would be weighted toward the budget that urban families would have, and there would be additional items, and then the rural family would be required to spend a certain percentage of the budget on the food stamps. And the basic problem this imposes is that the people frequently cannot afford to put the amount of money into the food stamps that they are required to put in; therefore, they either are forced not to participate in the program—they cannot afford to put up the money—or they participate in the program, but this works a great hardship on families in other areas, which is causing another need that families may have.

There is some experience in Mississippi which is particularly germane to this question of participation where many counties which have previously been participating in the commodity distribution program have been going to the food stamp program. There have been some studies made that the dropouts among these people who have been receiving commodity distribution, a program which has a lot of problems associated with it, that I will not go into, that three-quarters of the people in eight counties of the study who have been receiving commodities, which shows they knew of the program, they were eligible for the program, and they had sufficiently low incomes, with sufficients that they wanted to participate in the program, and three-quarters of the people were forced out of the program when the food stamp program replaced the commodity distribution program. And the reason for this, for this dropout can be seen if one looks more carefully at, for example, how the budgeting is done.

On the second page of my statement I give an example of the budget standard requirements. If a family has an income—this is Mississippi—in the range of zero to $30 per month total income—and I might say that there are a lot of families that have no income—that a family of six with such an income is asked to spend or is asked to spend $12 a month on the purchase of stamps. That family receives, if it can get up to $12, $70 worth of stamps. The $58 bonus is really quite susbtantial, really quite helpful if it can find the initial $12 to put into the program. Obviously, a family that has no income cannot put up the $12 and many of the people with an income of $30 are being asked to put up $12, into food stamps, frequently can cause serious problems in other areas.

This simply identifies the insensitivity of the standards to the actual needs that people have in terms of operating under one of these programs.

So there are a lot of other problems associated with the program. I might mention the welfare recipient and the people who are in the program cannot buy toothpaste, toilet paper, and other needed house-

hold items that normally are available in grocery stores and food markets, those are not included because they are nonfood products. This would be a lesser problem, of course, if it were not for the fact that they have to put such a large percentage of their budget into these food stamps in the first place.

I might say that in my dealing with recipients with the problems, as to the question of beer, tobacco and alcoholic beverages it has never arisen. I have never heard a complaint from people that they could not buy such items as these. The needs for low income people is so basic and the myth has been so overstated about the misuse of this program, I think that this should be pointed out.

There are other problems, other policies, that aggravate these problems. I simply call attention to the fact that the stamps are nontransferable, which increases the burden. In fact, if you have an emergency and you need to get some cash, there is no way once you have gotten into the program of redeeming the stamps for cash, either by going back to the agency, and you are not permitted to transfer these to another person who may have a need for the stamps.

There are also problems that arise over the fact that the stamps are frequently issued on a given day during a given limited period. And the merchant then raises all the prices. There are misuses along the line of the merchant cheating—there have been complaints about the merchant cheating, because in many jurisdictions they require the merchant to tear the stamps out and make it easy for him to tear out stamps which are more than the recipents are actually supposed to be paying for the product.

I would like to get on to a few of the recommendations that might be made for improving and changing the food stamp distribution program.

The main thing that really should be done is that instead of giving stamps at all, it would be for the Department of Agriculture simply to give the bonus amount of money in cash to the recipient. It has been said here that the recipients would not spend the money on food. That I think is an irresponsible statement. The experts within the Department of Agriculture have told me that they are quite sure that at least one-third of such income if it were given in cash would be spent on food and probably a higher percentage because that if the normal distribution that the low income people normally spend. And if they got another dollar they would spend at least one-third of it on foodstuffs. This would then serve the purposes of the program in terms of increasing the consumption of food surpluses. It would be less efficient than if you forced the people to spend 100 percent of the money on food, but I would submit that some reduction in the consumption of efficiency is desirable if we are to have a program that is to best serve the needs of the people who are the recipients of the program.

Another alternative that would probably increase the efficiency and probably not work too great a hardship would be if the bonus amount was given in stamps but the recipient still not have to pay any cash for the stamps. If you were certified for a certain amount of food stamp bonus that you simply would get the bonus amount in cash.

People in the Department of Agriculture argue that the reason that they do not do such a program is that it is less efficient, so far as the

consumption of food is concerned and that the recipient might indeed spend some of his principal of the food budget on other kinds of items. I do not think that it would go into tobacco and alcoholic beverages; that is, any significant amount, but I think that they would in fact go into some degree of other very needed items and that a very substantial portion of it would still, of course, be spent on food.

There are a number of other kinds of things that might be done to relieve the pressures that I think many feel are less desirable.

One which I might simply cite is that there be set aside a range of investment into the food stamps instead of having a fixed dollar amount, and this range, for example, in the case that I cited of a family from zero to $30 per month income might be specified instead of saying that a family of six with zero income must spend $12 on food stamps and you would give a range and say that they could spend from zero dollars, recognizing the fact that they might not have any money to spend up to $12 a month in the food stamps and then they would be given the bonus, and the exact definition of where the amount they actually spent could be determined would be by the local welfare department in consultation with the individual family rather than imposing this arbitrary Government standard as to what people must buy in the program.

These are then measures that could greatly relieve the tensions and the problems caused to the recipients and would, I believe, cause greatly increased participation in the programs.

I might mention that the Department is optimistic about the participation in the program. In fact, the participation rates are very low among the people who are otherwise eligible as the dropout rate, as I indicated in my statement clearly tends to show.

There are other matters that I think might be taken that are very important. One is actually fundamental that the Department of Agriculture and the local welfare departments be required to make the regulations that govern these programs available to the public, particularly the recipients of the program. I have noticed that many of the members of the committee here have not had access to the regulations that govern the programs and did not know how to respond to complaints that recipients had made that they were not being fairly treated under the program.

This is a general program with these programs that the regulations are not made available to the people as to what their entitlements are under the program and under what rules the programs operate. They should be simple information, widely distributed and widely available under these programs. I might mention that I requested from the Food Stamp Division the regulations that govern the programs in the various States and was told recently that it is their policy that they could not make these informations available to me unless they got some prior approval within the Department of Agriculture which illustrates the fact that one cannot routinely simply get this information on a regular basis, yet alone the Department of Agriculture having affirmative programs of seeing that the information is readily distributed to the recipients.

Finally, there should be measures which would govern the problem that there are not adequate outlets, particularly in many of the large

urban centers in the ghetto areas where people or recipients can get a fair deal from local merchants.

Consumer problems have received increasing attention in the poverty program. One suggestion that we offer is that the Government make a commissary facility available to low-income people and perhaps establish Government-operated food commissaries in low-income areas in which case the buying power of the Federal Government could be brought to bear to allow the recipients of these programs access to food relatively low priced rather than at the very high prices that they are frequently forced to pay because they are captive audiences in these communities.

In conclusion I would like to point out that the present policies of the Department of Agriculture which force and require the purchase of stamps, particularly for welfare recipients, if they want to participate in Federal Government's program violates the money payment principles of the Social Security Act. This says that the recipient of public assistance is entitled to have this public assistance in cash and is to determine the expenditure of these funds as he sees fit. And if there are some vestiges of a voluntary nature to this program which perhaps avoids the letter of the conflict of the act, it certainly violates the principle of the act and I think, certainly we believe, works great hardship on the recipients in the program.

We believe the food stamp program should be continued and in fact greatly expanded but that these onerous restrictions certainly should be eliminated in the expansion of the program.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Are there any questions?

Mr. RARICK. I was wondering if you would mind telling us what you are a doctor of?

Mr. WILEY. I am a Ph. D. in organic chemistry.

Mr. RARICK. You are a medical physician?

Mr. WILEY. Ph.D.

Mr. RARICK. And is the gentleman beside you Mr. Rachlin?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. Carl Rachlin.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Rachlin, you are an attorney of some national recognition, is that correct?

Mr. RACHLIN. I had the occasion to take up to the Supreme Court a case in Louisiana and I won that case.

Mr. RARICK. And your office is in New York—your address is what?

Mr. RACHLIN. 150 Nassau Street, New York City. I previously had my office at 38 Park Road at the time you may have addressed mail to me on the prior occasion.

Mr. RARICK. You have also been represented in places in suits involving racial problems?

Mr. RACHLIN. I used to be general counsel of the Congress of Racial Equality.

Mr. RARICK. Are you also connected in any way with Spartacist?

Mr. RACHLIN. I have never heard of them—I do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. RARICK. Are you a member of the National Lawyers Guild?

Mr. RACHLIN. I am not a member. I have been.

Mr. RARICK. I notice in the booklet that was passed out that you indicate that the poor people have a legal right to this food. Is this under the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. RACHLIN. Legal rights, other than constitutional rights—rights are guaranteed by the statute.

Mr. RARICK. Guaranteed by the what?

Mr. RACHLIN. The statutes involved—they have the right to qualify under the statute. If they qualify they have a legal entitlement to the benefit of the program.

Mr. RARICK. I noted from your literature that there is being planned an organization and demonstration on behalf of the poor people of the country.

Mr. WILEY. Not on behalf of, but by the poor people.

Mr. RARICK. By the poor people?

Mr. WILEY. Who are finally organizing and are beginning to raise their voices in protest against some of these injustices that are perpretated upon them by many of these programs.

Mr. RARICK. This is a voluntary act against the oppression of the American Government, is that it?

Mr. WILEY. In many States, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, Alabama, particularly, the people are denied benefits, public assistance benefits, welfare benefits by arbitrary rules which do not relate to the needs that the family has for such assistance.

For example, the substitute parent rule, for example, are some of the worst which are implied to deny people.

Mr. RARICK. You are against marriage?

Mr. WILEY. To deny them public assistance. I am for marriage. And one of the things that I must say is that in most of these States——

Mr. RARICK. Are you for people working?

Mr. WILEY. In most of these cases if there is an unemployed man in the household they are denied any assistance whether there is a job available to that person or not. And this is one of the very basic injustices of the program—one of the things—one of the reasons why there are in many of the Southern States there are so many people that qualify for food stamps than qualify for public assistance, for example. I think in Mississippi there are two or three people who qualify for food stamps who do not qualify for public assistance that have equally low income because those people are denied——

Mr. RARICK. You did not answer. Are you against working?

Mr. WILEY. I am very much for working, in favor of it.

Mr. RARICK. Has your organization done anything to try to create any jobs to try to locate these people where they can put their labor and sweat behind building a better America?

Mr. WILEY. As a matter of fact, we have as one of the basic premises of our organization that people who can work should work.

Mr. RARICK. Is that in your booklet, is that in any of your literature?

Mr. WILEY. It is in our literature which I can send to the committee. We have proposed——

Mr. RARICK. Is it in the literature that you have given us here this morning?

Mr. WILEY. We submitted background about a little bit of the history, about the identification of our organization—I could submit to you the goals developed—the national welfare rights movement—at its two national meetings which have been held which you will find include asking the Government to step in and create jobs where there are no jobs available to people.

Mr. RARICK. Let me ask you this. If these are such poor people and you have a six-page booklet here on your organization all over the United States, how do you support this? How do you raise the money to go to these meetings?

Mrs. HORN. We are very glad to be here today and to hear some of the statements that have been made in this room.

Being a recipient myself I really feel outraged—I really do, you know, to hear some of this. I am really surprised as to how the power structure works. I was incensed myself upon the basis of your saying, of getting up there twitting us and all of this stuff, that if they could, that if they were able to they would do so, but as a recipient and speaking for the millions and millions of recipients I feel that if I can receive a welfare check I do not feel that I can live like a slave or should feel even being looked at like a slave. I feel as I am an American citizen. I feel as though when you make up a program that you should think of the people as Americans—that you are making it up for Americans and not for people who are slaves or something, like you should get a different idea. This is America. This hurts and it is wrong.

Mr. RARICK. Have you heard me say anything like that?

Mrs. HORN. We are doing—we definitely do.

Mr. RARICK. I have been a judge for 5 years where the black people consisted of 70 percent of the population. I have heard many family problems in court. I have faced judicial concern in trying to find out who the mammas and the daddys were, and never received any support from the NAACP and CORE and other agitating people. Why do you not put some of the money that you are spending touring all over the country and use it to take care of some of these unfortunate little children? After you leave an area, of course, these people are all split up and it takes the white folks and the colored folks a long time to overcome the hard feelings and to come back together. That is what you denounce as the "power structure"—local people trying to solve their own problems and live as neighbors. I have not said anything against this food program.

Mrs. HORN. But you have.

Mr. RARICK. When you cannot trust your own kind, what should be done is to give them bread and milk and to give them food. They are not going to use distributed food on parties. I know that. We know that they are not going to trade food in the hand on Sweet Lucy wine.

Mrs. HORN. I do not think any of it is.

Mr. RARICK. They will feed their——

Mrs. HORN. I do not think any of the recipients——

Mr. RARICK. I certainly have not said anything that I am against your people, have I?

Mrs. HORN. But as you started to say——

Mr. RARICK. You said that I am a member of the power structure. I do not know. I do not think that I am very powerful. I am trying to solve the problems, not to create the problem or make a problem worse.

Mrs. HORN. In solving it, as you say, you are trying to solve the problems. I hoped that you would look at it from trying to solve it for American people and not for American slaves.

Mr. RARICK. I have not said anything about slaves.

Mrs. HORN. What you are saying, you are even looking down on the recipients.

Mr. RARICK. I am looking down on what?

Mrs. HORN. You are the way you are talking, the words that you used.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not believe that this is conducive of any information on the bills that we are discussing.

Mrs. HORN. It is not.

Mr. RARICK. I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions about these bills?

If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you all.

This will conclude the hearing this morning. The committee will resume tomorrow morning and we will hear Mrs. Sullivan as the first witness and then Congressman Sisk and then Congressman Vigorito and then Mr. Harry Graham of the National Grange.

We will include your entire statement together with its attachments in the record at this point.

(The prepared statement of George A. Wiley follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE A. WILEY, DIRECTOR, POVERTY/RIGHTS ACTION CENTER

Chairman Poage, members of the Committee, my name is George Wiley. I am Director of the *Poverty/Rights Action Center in Washington, D.C. which is the national headquarters for welfare recipient organizations across the country.* With me are *Mrs. Etta Horn, vice-chairman of the National Coordinating Committee of Welfare Rights Groups* and a welfare recipient who participates in the food stamp program here in the District of Columbia; and *Mr. Carl Rachlin* of the Scholarship, Education and Defense Fund for Racial Equality, who serves as *general counsel* to our organization.

The National Welfare Rights Movement is a federation of over 200 welfare rights organizations from 26 states and more than 70 communities. A list of the welfare rights groups and the brief history of the welfare rights movement is appended for your information.

The Food Stamp Act of 1964 was enacted with the dual purpose of "strengthening our agricultural economy" and providing "improved levels of nutrition among low-income households." The program may be effectively serving the interests of producers, distributors and retailers of agricultural products, but is insensitive to the needs and interests of the low-income families that it is also supposed to serve.

The program appears to have been conceived, developed, and operated over the past two years with little or no consultation with recipients of food stamps and little or no consideration of hardships that the program actually causes them.

Low income people want better nutrition for their families. They want the benefits of the food bonuses that the program offers. But they do not want the severe budgetary restrictions that the food stamp program imposes.

The most fundamental and universal complaint of food stamp recipients is that they are forced to commit a major portion of already inadequate budgets to the purchase of food stamps. Most recipients feel that the amount they must tie up in food stamps is more than they can afford to spend on food and still

meet the other needs of their families. In addition, restricting the use of a sizeable portion of a meager budget greatly increases financial hardship.

A welfare recipient or low-income person is always operating on a very strict budget. His obligations for rent, utilities, laundry, and transportation are rather firmly fixed. For most people living below the poverty line (this includes all welfare recipients) there is no contingency money in the budget should a child need a winter coat or a pair of shoes or other special needs. Everyone who has a family knows that practically every month there is some kind of special need or other that was not planned for, but which must be met. For poor people these items have to be managed by stretching the food dollar further and simply living on more austere rations.

It is no consolation to a family who is participating in the food stamp program to know that the family is eating well, if a child has no winter coat or shoes to wear to school.

The procedures used by the Department of Agriculture to arrive at the food budget for an individual family is subject to considerable question. Many factors are apparently averaged in arriving at standard budgets on a regional basis, taking little or no account of either local conditions or individual problems that recipients may have. For example, rural families in a largely urban area are particularly penalized. For these families average expenditures for food are estimated too high, forcing the rural food stamp recipients to invest larger amounts in food stamp purchases than he would normally spend for food. This forces him to impose additional hardships on his family in other budgetary areas, or forgo participation in the program entirely.

Even if the Department of Agriculture had accurate estimates of the average amounts of money people of a given income and a given family size would spend for food, this average figure which they use will be too high for half of the recipients since roughly half of the people would be spending amounts above the average and half spending amounts below the average.

The serious nature of problems arising from Agriculture's arbitrary standards for food expenditures is seen most clearly in the operation of the food stamp program in Mississippi. There, large numbers of people had been participating in the surplus commodities program as a means of survival. (This program is itself fraught with problems, including low quality of goods by the time they are received by the recipient and arbitrary and discriminatory distribution procedures often employed by local authorities.)

Many counties in Mississippi are converting to the food stamp program. A study by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission shows that for eight of these counties three-quarters of the people who had been receiving commodities dropped out of the food program when their county converted to food stamps.

An example of the Department of Agriculture's stamp purchase requirements should help explain this high drop-out rate. A Mississippi family of six with income in the range of 0 to 30 dollars per month is asked to spend $12 per month on stamps for which he receives $70 worth of stamps. The $58 bonus is generous enough if one can afford the initial $12.

Obviously a family with no income cannot afford the $12.

The dramatic drop-out rate illustrates that substantial numbers of people who needed the food program (as witnessed by their participation in a miserable commodities program) were eligible for the food stamp program and knew about the food stamp program apparently could not afford to participate due to the cost of the stamps. Undoubtedly many of these who did participate did so at the expense of other important family needs.

Several of the other problems of the program follow from the problem of having to invest a large share of one's budget into the stamps in the first place. For example, a common complaint of recipients is the fact that they may not buy items such as soap, toothpaste, toilet paper, and other household items normally available in supermarkets and purchased along with the family groceries. This complaint would have less force were it not for the large cash investment that the food stamp program requires of families.

The problem of the large cash investment required each month for the purchase of stamps is aggravated by several other policies under which the program operates. There is pressure upon recipients to maintain continuous participation in the program or suffer periods of disqualification or suspension. This policy aggravates the problem of a family that has other emergency needs which would lead it to choose not to buy food stamps in some given month.

Of similar force are the policies which prevent stamps from being transferred from one recipient to another. If the stamps were transferable or redeemable for cash this would clearly help to increase the flexibility of the recipient's budget.

There are a number of ancillary problems that flow from the program. Many recipients feel that they are stigmatized in the stores where they purchase because the use of the stamps identifies them as a welfare recipient or other low-income person.

There are also problems in many jurisdictions which require the merchant to detach the stamps. Recipients are sometimes cheated since by sleight-of-hand he can slip out extra stamps. There is also the fact that the stamps are issued in many areas on specific days and local stores raise prices and bring in lower quality products around the days the food stamps are issued.

Recommendations: There are several changes that should be made in the program to make it of greater benefit to the recipient. First it would be far better to simply substitute a cash bonus for the whole food stamp process. That is to say *if the Department of Agriculture determines that a person of a given family size and a given income is entitled to a certain amount of food stamp bonus, they should simply give them that amount of bonus in cash rather than in stamps.*

This would clearly avoid all the problems cited above.

A second alternative that would be neary as good would be again for *no cash to be required of the recipient, and that the bonus be given in the form of food stamps.* In this case there would be a restriction on the way the bonus could be spent, but no restriction on the way in which the recipients food budget principal may be used.

I am told by representatives of the Department of Agriculture that the objections to these proposals is that they tend to reduce the efficiency of the program, as a program for increasing food consumption and thereby making less effective use of agricultural surpluses or agricultural surplus productivity.

Though these arguments are valid they should be balanced against the needs and interests of the recipient. The proposals offered would reduce but not destroy the effectiveness of these programs in promoting food consumption. The Department of Agriculture experts admit that even if they gave out dollars instead of stamps, low-income people would probably spend about a third of each dollar on food. The second proposal would probably be even more efficient, probably inducing a food consumption efficiency of the order of 50 or 60 per cent of the extra dollars given.

We submit that *it is proper for the Department of Agriculture, the Congress and the public to accept some reduction of efficiency in the program as a food consumption program to accommodate interests and needs of the low-income people who are recipients of this program.*

A variety of other procedures might be used to partially reduce the cash outlay hardship on recipients while maintaining a high food consumption efficiency. One might be to reverse the stamp process by issuing stamps to the retailer who would issue the recipient stamps in proportion to food purchased for cash. The recipient could then redeem his stamp credits for bonus stamps at periodic intervals. Recipients would still carry a card to certify his eligibility to the retailer. This approach would not help the family with no income.

Another variant is for the Department of Agriculture to specify an acceptable range of stamp purchase requirement. Ranges should begin at zero for families with little or no income. The exact purchase requirement would then be worked out on an individual basis by the local welfare department in consultation with the recipient.

The Department of Agriculture contends that there are discretionary provisions in the current regulations which allow the individual flexibility described above. If this is true few recipients know about it and it is seldom used by the local welfare departments. Caseworkers are frequently poorly trained and rely upon mechanical application of the procedures, i.e., reading from a table.

The Department of Agriculture should be required *to make the rules and regulations governing the program available to recipients.* This requirement should also be imposed upon local welfare departments administering food stamp programs. Accessibility of this kind of information is fundamental if the rights of recipients under the program are to be protected.

A requirement that stamps be purchasable in smaller quantities at more frequent intervals and at decentralized locations could also provide some partial relief to recipients.

One other idea would be well worth attention. The surplus commodity program which the food stamp program replaces wherever it is adopted incorporates together with many limitations an important principle—that is it utilizes the potent buying power of the federal government in behalf of both producer and consumer.

Although we do not often think of it in this connection, the federal government utilizes this massive purchasing power on behalf of a substantial group of citizens already through its operation of commissaries—essentially discount supermarkets government-operated for the benefit of armed forces families.

We believe that food stamp families should have access to these commissaries *and* that similar government commissaries could be established in ghetto communities to jointly aid producer and consumer of food stuffs. Such a plan could effectively connect the food stamp bonus principle to the massive purchasing power of the government in behalf of low-income families, food producers and all of us.

In conclusion, let me say that we believe that the present policies requiring the purchase of stamps violate the spirit if not the letter of the Social Security Act, which guarantees recipients of public assistance the right to money payments to spend without restriction, as a recipient sees fit. The food stamp program employs measures designed to subvert the "money payment principle" by requiring persons of limited income to accept restriction on the use of part of their income in order to receive the bonus benefits that are available from the program.

We believe that the food stamp program should be continued and greatly expanded with the elimination of the onerous restrictions which it now imposes.

The CHAIRMAN. I also have a telegram which I have received which will be made a part of the record at this point. It was received from Mr. Oren Lee Staley, president of the National Farmers Organization of Corning, Iowa.

It will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The telegram follows:)

CORNING, IOWA, *March 14, 1967.*

Congressman POAGE,
Chairman, House Agricultural Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

We welcome this opportunity to offer our support for the proposed food stamp and child nutrition legislation and respectfully request that we be entered into the record as being in support of this legislation.

OREN LEE STALEY,
President, National Farmers Organization.

The CHAIRMAN. We will now recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m. the hearing recessed to reconvene at 10 a.m., Thursday, March 15, 1967.)

EXTEND THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964 AND AMEND THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1967

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Abbitt, Jones of Missouri, Purcell, O'Neal, de la Garza, Vigorito, Jones of North Carolina, Nichols, Montgomery, Brasco, Stuckey, Rarick, Belcher, Teague, May, Dole, Hansen, Wampler, Goodling, Miller, Burke, Mathias, Mayne, Zwach, Kleppe, Price, and Myers.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, clerk; Hyde H. Murray, assistant counsel; Francis LeMay, staff consultant; and Fowler C. West, assistant staff consultant.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

We are meeting again today for the consideration of the several bills that are before us relating to the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and to the extension of the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

I believe our first witness this morning is our colleague Mrs. Leonor K. Sullivan, a Member of Congress from the State of Missouri.

We will be delighted to hear from you now, Mrs. Sullivan.

STATEMENT OF HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was anxious to testify because, with so many new people on your committee this year, I know there are many questions about this program. Many of the members do not have food stamp projects in their districts. Unless members have actually been involved in seeing how this distribution of food works under the food stamp plan, they may not readily appreciate the advantages this system holds over direct distribution of free food. I would like, if I may, to read my statement, and then I will be most happy to answer any questions from the members of the committee that I can.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, you may proceed.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Chairman Poage and members of the Committee on Agriculture:

In many respects, this is like "old home week" for me, for I have testified before this committee on so many occasions on food stamp

legislation since the first hearings on my first food stamp bill back in 1954 that I have lost count. There were many hearings, and a good deal of heated controversy in all of them. I hope this one will be different.

I hope now that there will be general agreement in this committee that the food stamp program makes sense; that it works; that it helps the farmers by increasing substantially the domestic consumption of meat, fresh milk, fresh eggs, fresh fruits, and fresh vegetables; that it assures good, American-standard-of-living diets for millions of needy Americans otherwise going hungry in the midst of agricultural abundance; and that it has been far less expensive and far more effective than some of you may have suspected when we discussed the idea here in previous years.

We did a great deal of jousting in this committee in the 88th Congress but—thanks to the present chairman and to the former chairman—a bill was finally reported and it turned out to be a pretty good bill. I have always been grateful. Interestingly enough, even some of the Members who opposed the legislation, and voted against it, nevertheless worked hard on it in committee and made good suggestions, and I appreciated that, too.

Now, we have a good program to review, not a group of pilot projects or a mere idea. As I pointed out in the material I placed in the Congressional Record on Tuesday in preparation for these hearings—material I hope you all have had a chance to see—more than 650 food stamp projects are now in operation, and they are located in the congressional districts of more than half of the Members of the House, plus the District of Columbia.

In every one of those 650 or more localities, local people made the decision to seek the program, State officials made the request officially to the Department of Agriculture, and the projects were instituted under regulations worked out by the States in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture. No project was imposed on any locality.

All of these areas choose the food stamp program in preference to the system of direct distribution of surplus food. They did so knowing that many of the local beneficiaries would grumble over the fact that under the one program they had received food handouts free, and under the new one they must pay a sizable—a very substantial—portion of their income for food in order to obtain a better diet than they could possibly afford on their own resources.

In the material I placed in the Congressional Record Tuesday, I listed—by congressional districts—all of the projects now in operation, those scheduled shortly to start as a result of official designation, and those additional areas actively seeking the food stamp program pending appropriation of sufficient funds for further expansion. As I stated in my remarks in the Record, I was surprised to discover that 16 of the 35 members of this committee do not have the food stamp program operating anywhere in their districts—eight of the 20 Democrats and eight of the 15 Republicans—and no projects are presently scheduled to begin shortly in any of those 16 districts.

I am deeply sorry about that. I hope that when H.R. 1318 becomes law, and additional funds can be provided to expand the program in

the new fiscal year, the local officials in those 16 districts can prevail upon their State governments to get busy and get them included. I am somewhat ashamed that, except for my own city of St. Louis, no jurisdiction in the entire State of Missouri has been permitted by the State to come into the program. We are trying to change that in the State legislature.

What makes me particularly sorry about the fact that so many of the members of this committee do not have firsthand experience in their own districts with the food stamp program in that they may find it hard to believe what the rest of us say about the wonderful achievements of this program—in making food purchasers out of millions of people previously existing on the thin edge of hunger and subsisting on the wrong foods—usually whatever came free in what they call in some areas, "living on the commodities."

Every Member of Congress who has had food stamp projects operating for any length of time in his district can tell heart warming stories about the change the food stamp plan has brought to elderly couples on social security, families on relief, and large families where—no matter how hard he might work—the father could never earn enough to feed the family adequately and still pay for rent and other necessities.

I have said it before, and I am not shy about saying it here: If there had been a food stamp program in operation in St. Louis when I was a girl, my parents and the nine children in our family undoubtedly would have qualified for participation from time to time, and it would have been a big help to us.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of what this committee 3 years ago helped me to achieve. True, there were some unusual political aspects then to the fight over the legislation. I dimly recall there was a wheat-corn bill also struggling to win House passage; and I have read somewhere that there was something known as a quid pro quo, which I believe is Latin for "if the farm folks want a wheat-corn bill, we city folks want a food stamp bill."

Whatever the circumstances which led this committee to vote for the food stamp bill in 1964—and for similar legislation in 1959 after having previously turned it down both times—the end result has more than justified the courage and wisdom this committee demonstrated. For, long after our wheat and corn surpluses may be things of the past in a hungry world, the food stamp program you passed will undoubtedly still be operating; that is, if American farmers continue to produce more than Americans can buy and consume, and if H.R. 1318 is enacted to authorize further appropriations after this fiscal year.

Please keep in mind that the food stamp program is not a substitute for welfare payments. No State may reduce welfare benefits because of the operation of the food stamp program. Since a rather high percentage of the welfare family's income must go for food—and nothing else—under the food stamp program, the States will still have to revise welfare benefits to meet other needs of their needy, regardless of the food assistance. But in making the food stamp program possible, this committee has increased food consumption here in the United States. Since we have been so successful in feeding the hungry elsewhere for so many years, it is a source of real satisfaction

77-523—67——6

to know that so many of our own needy are also eating well, and that additional needy families in the area not now enjoying this fine program can eventually be covered under it, too, if this bill passes.

If we enact H.R. 1318, calling for an open-ended program limited only by the funds Congress actually appropriates each year, we are not running a risk of overexpansion or excessive cost. Just remember that when economic conditions improve, many beneficiaries automatically go off the program; and as retraining programs succeed, and also our many educational opportunity programs, persons or families now eligible for food stamps will increase their incomes and leave the food stamp prgram for good. If there shall ever be a sudden upward surge in participation in food stamp projects because of recession or other cause, however, it would not mean an automatic increase in the cost of the program; for the annual appropriation still stands and there would have to be a proportional cutback in the issuance of free stamps to keep the program within budget allowances—unless Congress should decide to vote additional funds. So we have complete control from that standpoint. No deficits may develop in this program by reason of expanded participation.

You have given the American people—those who need help—a taste of what it is like to eat well and to provide their children with the kind of food they require for strong and healthy growth. The members of this committee, particularly those who voted for the program 3 years ago, can be deeply proud of their legislative handiwork. Those who now vote for this bill, H.R. 1318, will also share the same pride as this program continues and expands. Hungry people, I am sure, will bless you for what this program means to them. And we can all sleep better after a good hearty dinner knowing that fresh meat, and fresh eggs, and fresh milk, and fresh fruits, and fresh or canned or frozen vetgetables and juices, and all of the good things in the stores which we take for granted as part of our daily diets are also now within the reach of those who, for grinding long years, have lived on dried beans, powdered milk, powdered eggs, corn meal, starches and flour, and, occasionally some butter or canned meat; and who seldom knew what it was like to eat a decent, well balanced, adequately nutritious meal.

I urge your prompt approval of H.R. 1318 and, with your help, its expeditious passage by the House and enactment into law, so that this excellent program can go forward—not wither and die after so dramatically establishing its value to this Nation, to our agriculture, to the food industry, and, most important of all, to those Americans who need a little help in making a go of it in the richest country in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Sullivan.

You have made an excellent statement. Something which is worth the consideration of the committee. I think that your statement should go a long way to clear up some of the questions which arose yesterday through the testimony of certain witnesses who seemed to be more interested in receiving a handout without working than they were in whether anyone was going to have an opportunity to work for a living. I think it is clear, from what you have said, that the food stamp program as it is now functioning does not provide for a handout

of money to anyone, but simply provides an opportunity for those who are willing to spend a part of their income on food to get a better meal.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would like to cite the St. Louis experience when this program started there. But, first, I want to present to the committee a man who has worked with me for the last 14 years to help get this plan into being, Mr. Charles B. Holstein, who originally was in my office when this legislation was first introduced; and who is now with the Committee on Banking and Currency as a member of the staff on the Consumers Affairs Subcommittee. If we get into some of the more complex details, he may be able to help me.

I heard several questions yesterday about the regulations for the stamp program, and something to the effect that if a person would pay $2, they would get $10 worth of stamps. That would be a rather extreme case.

On page A–1286 of Tuesday's Congressional Record, I have listed some of the purchase requirements based on family size and income, and these vary widely. It is not $10 worth for $2, but a sliding scale.

I want to tell you that when this program first started, these regulations were set up by the Department to apply in the same way to places like Detroit, St. Louis, or any large city, as they were supposed to operate in rural areas such as, say, down in the district of our colleague, Paul Jones, down in what we call Little Dixie, where they have economic standards entirely different from those in the big cities where rents and other expenses are so much different. After months and months, and many telephone calls and conferences, fighting constantly with the Department here and the State welfare people, we got the regulations made more flexible, to meet the distinctive problems of the various areas where the program operates.

Let me just give you one example here: This is for a family of seven with an income—I will start with the lowest—up to $39 a month. They would have to use $14 of their own money, and they would get a total of $78 worth of coupons, so that the bonus would be $64 for that family of seven with $39.99 income per month.

Now, we will go to the highest, a family of seven with an income of $360 to $389.99 per month would have to spend $112 of their own money, and they would get back $148 worth of stamps, giving them a bonus only of $36. That is for seven people in the family with a top income of 1 penny under $400 a month. That is a sample of the range of income covered. For smaller families, the requirements, of course, are different.

This plan has worked for people who have never received 1 cent of welfare, but who are in the low-income group. The husband is working, but the family income is too low to enable that family to eat properly. Such families put up, according to the charts that are made up for the number in the family and the size of the income, the amount of money they would normally be expected to spend for food and with that amount they can buy the stamps and get a bonus, according to their salary and according to the number in the household, to assure a good, low-cost nutritious diet.

In St. Louis, when we put this into effect, in January 1963, thousands of families previously getting free food failed to sign up for food stamps. We dropped from—I am not certain about the exact

number, but from something like 50,000 people who had been receiving the direct food distribution handouts once a month of dried beans, dried milk, flour, and things like that, to about 7,500 on the food stamp program. Under the free food program if anyone looked like they needed help or wanted extra food, they would apply, and because it was food that was just being given out, with few questions asked they did not have to go through the kind of careful certification that they now must go through when they get stamps, and, as I have started to say, the total number of people going from the old program to the new one dropped from somewhere around 50,000 to about 7,500.

This indicated two things: People had been receiving free food who should not have received it; also, people got the idea of "Why should I pay my own money for food stamps when I was getting food free and I could use my money for whatever else I wanted: I could use it for anything that I wanted to use it for." It took a great deal of education on the benefits of the food stamp program to get the people who needed this help to sign up for it and buy the stamps. Also, we had to make the purchase requirements more practical. Some people just did not have the money they were asked to pay for the food stamps. We had the regulations made more flexible and now we have three times as many people participating as we did at first.

I remember a question that someone asked the Department yesterday—as to the people who administered the food stamp programs—whether there were enough people properly trained to answer the questions of those who were inquiring about the program and how to participate in it. I may say that in St. Louis, for almost a year after the program started, the caseworker, the social worker or the office employee in the food stamp office was inadequately trained or just didn't care about getting the proper information to the people who came before them.

The first question they asked was: "What is your income?" And when they found that out, they might say: "You do not qualify," and they would not ask for further details: they would not ask what the expenses of the family were: they would not ask for any details, and it was only after constant pushing on my part and on the part of others, that this was changed. Since then, great progress has been made and participation has tripled to 23,000 people.

And this is why I say that any member who has a food stamp program in his own district and has not had these experiences should inquire into the program in his locality. It is interesting. You can do a great deal from this end to cut out a lot of redtape and help the needy to obtain a good diet for their families.

One of our settlement houses had some 300 women volunteers who went into the poorer neighborhoods, going from door to door, to visit with the families to see what their problems were—to see what the conditions of the families were—and to try to help. They were signing the elderly for medicare and while in these homes they explained in detail what the food stamp plan was and why they had to put up their own money in order to get the stamps. They also explained that if the household could show expenses for rent that were higher than one-third of their income, and if they could show monthly medical bills that were constant, these things would be taken into consideration

in determining the portion of their income which had to be budgeted for food stamps, depending upon the number of people in the family. When the people in low-income neighborhoods understood how these things worked, there were thousands of people who could qualify who decided to sign up, merely because someone had taken the time and the trouble to go into the details with the families and to go into the background of the plan.

In one low-income area we had one grocery store whose owner cheated, who bought the stamps—I do not know from how many families, but he bought the stamps from the families and gave them something else besides food for these stamps, or applied the stamps to back bills, or gave cash. The moment this was found out—and it was disclosed by other recipients telling tales on the grocery store—the privilege of handling the stamps was taken away from this grocer and he could never get back on the program.

Some of his customers in the area wrote to me to ask if I could not make a plea in his behalf, because this grocer, they said, had been so good to them that they would like to trade with him again. My answer to them was that we definitely and purposely wrote penalties into the law to prevent cheating either by the grocer or by the recipient, and if they did cheat then I thought that the privilege should be taken away. For it was a privilege to participate.

Believe me, the punishment in this case had a very good effect on others who might have been tempted to cheat.

Under the program of direct distribution of free food which is still going on in some areas, and which had previously been in operation in our area, I would venture to say that a great portion of that free food was wasted or traded for other things or sold for cash. In the first place, when these families would come to the central depot to get their handout of food once a month, for a large family, you can stop and figure how difficult it would be to carry home a month's supply of flour, powdered milk, powdered eggs, dried beans, lard, cornmeal, and so on, and when they got home, under the conditions in which most of them lived, where they had small space, where were they going to store all of that food? It was a real problem.

We know that in some areas, when they were getting the free food, they were selling some of it or most of it for whatever cash they could get. It was a burden. Many of them said: "We cannot use up this much flour or dried milk."

One of the other questions that someone asked yesterday was: "How are these stamps spent?" "Do the people get an adequate diet?" That is difficult to control, but we have had good cooperation in my area from the settlement houses, the Extension Service home economists, and others. I think it has been true in many other parts of the country, too, where the grocery owners themselves have often taken an interest in those who came in with food stamps, to advise the people on what to buy; because of the criticisms made before the program began was that when they would get perhaps $100 worth of food stamps in their hands at one time that they would go in and see the nice big delicious cuts of meat in the store and all the other high-priced items and they might spend their whole month's supply for meat, with nothing left with which to buy the other staple foods.

Actually, the studies show that these people have tried to buy carefully.

The extension services of the land grant universities have extended their activities to the cities when the cities were allowed to come into the program, to educate consumers in low-income areas, to explain to them about a well-rounded diet and what kind of foods they should buy; that they should not always buy prepared foods, all packaged and ready to be put on the table, but instead buy the raw vegetables and prepare them themselves at a substantial saving; to buy raw fruit, because they would frequently get more nutrition out of things of this sort than they would from foods which are processed and canned or boxed, with all the so-called "built-in maid service" which is so common today in so many foods in the stores—at a much higher price, of course.

These are some of the experiences we have had in launching the food stamp plan. It is extremely interesting to go into this when you are called upon by constituents to help solve some of the problems, and if you get into it, it gets hold of you and you want to make it more perfect, but it will never be perfect. It is a wonderful way to see to it that needy people do get a better diet. In having low-income families buying, as they do now, through the local retail stores, we are certainly helping farmers, at least indirectly, by using more food and getting the people to enjoy a more adequate diet.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mrs. Sullivan. I know that the members want to ask you questions.

I do not know whether the members want to move along expeditiously with these bills or not—that is up to the committee entirely—and we do not want to cut anybody off, but I would hope when you ask questions you will ask them expeditiously and that they will be answered as shortly as is possible, because we have several more witnesses to hear this morning, and we should like to hear these witnesses, and if we have the opportunity we will have an executive session. If we take too much time, we will have to come back again. So, it is entirely up to the committee as to the amount of time that we spend on this.

Mr. Gathings?

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend the gentlelady for her splendid work which has been very successful.

I believe you introduced the first bill?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes, in 1954.

Mr. GATHINGS. You have been before this committee a number of times. It would be interesting to make a determination, it would seem to me, in those instances where these families have increased their income and have moved out of the food stamp program.

The program has been in effect now for almost 3 years. You may not have any figures in that regard at this time. It might be a little early to have those figures.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I could not tell you, Mr. Gathings, how many have graduated out of it in St. Louis. I could not give you that figure. Employment has risen substantially in St. Louis since our program began in 1963, so a lot of people got jobs and went off the program. We know that. I have some figures for Detroit. When the program started

there in 1961, there was 12 percent unemployment, and 80,000 people signed up for food stamps. With unemployment down to 6 percent in 1964, there were 57,000 on food stamps. Now, with the entire county included, only 45,000 get the stamps.

Could I ask: Before you proceed, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you are going to have any of the food store people, or food manufacturers, up here to talk to you on this?

The CHAIRMAN. None of them have asked for an opportunity to be heard.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The reason that I ask is that these gentleman were a great help in getting this program started. Their sales in low-income neighborhoods increased substantially. I think you will remember that people in the food industry came before the committee to express their interest in this legislation in previous years, because, of course, it does help the individual grocer to have the people who benefit from food stamps come in and buy food, rather than getting a direct handout of commodities from some municipal warehouse.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know if it is possible; I do not know how the committee will vote on it. I am not cutting anybody off, as I have already stated, and if they want to come in we will try to hear them, but I had the thought that it would be quite advantageous to the proponents of this legislation to let us get to a vote on it.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brasco.

Mr. BRASCO. Mrs. Sullivan, some moments ago you recalled the situation where there was a merchant who, apparently, abused the purpose with respect to trading in stamps. Are there any provisions for criminal prosecution with respect to this type of situation?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes; they were written into the law in 1964. This is one of the things that the subcommittee went over very carefully when they were working on the bill in the first place.

Mr. BRASCO. Are civil sanctions contained in it, too?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Let me quote from section 14(b) of Public Law 88–525:

> Whoever knowingly uses, transfers, acquires, or possesses coupons in any manner not authorized by this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act shall, if such coupons are of the value of $100 or more, be guilty of a felony and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both, or, if such coupons are of a value of less of $100, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year or both.

That is in the law now. There are similar penalties for fraudulently presenting the stamps for payment.

Mr. BRASCO. Is there any other way that has been introduced in the case of St. Louis, other than having someone inform on a merchant, whereby someone can watch or see whether or not the merchant's sales since the food program has been in is out of proportion, that he might thereby be an individual who is abusing the purpose of it?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. To my knowledge, I do not know the extent of the enforcement machinery. Federal money is involved, and so it should be checked. I imagine that they could only spot check individual stores, and not go into every one of the 50,000 grocery stores that are accepting stamps. Mr. Holstein reminds me that it is to the store's

advantage to "play ball," because when this flagrant violation occurred in St. Louis, it was written up in the newspapers and given quite a bit of publicity. It was a store near a big public housing development and the storeowner was not allowed to participate again, even though it would have been more convenience for the people who had the stamps to shop there. But the owner lost his customers. That made quite an impression on others tempted to cheat.

Mr. BRASCO. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Mrs. May?

Mrs. MAY. I want to congratulate you on a very fine statement. I just did want to point out in connection with the previous colloquy, the Secretary said that since the act was passed they have found it necessary to disqualify only 57 stores. That is a pretty good record.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I think the Secretary of Agriculture said there are some 50,000 stores now participating in the program nationally.

Mrs. MAY. Yes. And that they did send warnings to 189 stores for minor violations. And that they then investigated another 239 stores, but all of them were acquitted of any wrongdoing.

And I would like to say also that they stated there has been spot checking through the local people, and when I asked about this, it was stated that many violations had been brought to the attention of the authorities by someone who was trading in the stores.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Will you yield there?

Mrs. MAY. Yes.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I wonder whether you know whether or not any of these were what you call owners who were guilty of dishonesty were prosecuted by the Department of Justice?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I do not know. I can only cite the one case that I am very familiar with, where this man was depending upon residents in the housing project and other neighbors to buy in his store, and he was prohibited from participating any longer. He learned a very, very sad lesson.

I think that this punishment was worse than any fine that you could have given him, because there were not enough people in that neighborhood who would or could trade with him to make it worthwhile to continue in the business in that area. I believe he finally gave up and the store changed hands. Let me say that his violations were flagrant and repeated ones and he was ruled as incorrigible as far as this program was concerned. It was an unusual case.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. How much, if I may use the word, "policing" or supervision is there over the grocery stores to see if there is more of this than we realize?

Is there any plan or program on that?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I think that you would have to ask the Department on that. I could not answer that.

Mr. MYERS. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Goodling?

Mr. GOODLING. I would like to read one statement from your paper and ask you to elaborate on it just a bit.

You stated:

I was surprised to discover that 16 of the 35 members of this committee do not have the food stamp program operating anywhere in their districts.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes; and I said I am sorry, because I think that it is one of the most wonderful opportunities that a member can have, to go through some of the agonies of the poor people in their district who need help, and then to see how this has given them an uplift and a chance to feed their children properly. Before, they had to go out and get a handout once a month from some warehouse; today, through this food stamp program, they are taught how to budget their food money so that they can buy the stamps once a month and so that the food they buy will carry them through a whole month. We arranged for them to buy their stamps twice a month instead of monthly, and that has been even better. They go in and do their grocery shopping on a regular basis just as you and I do.

Mr. GOODLING. Are you saying that every district in the United States should have this program?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I do not know many congressional districts in the United States that do not have poor people. Do you know of any?

Mr. GOODLING. We do, and if we believe the Good Book, we always will have.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Jones?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I only have one comment, and it is with reference to following up the comment about the number of congressional districts that do not have this program in operation.

Of course, as you point this out in your statement, we only have this program in St. Louis, but I think that it could be pointed out that we have had a rather unique situation there in Missouri, because of our State laws. We have had a number of bills on this in the State legislature. I think that the leadership has come from the representatives of counties in the 10th District that I represent and that at least one if not two of the Senators from the district have legislation pending which will make it easier for these counties or these communities to put this program into effect.

It has been very difficult in this area. I do not know exactly the reason that has made it so difficult, but it has not been operated there. However, I understand now that the director of welfare, Mr. Carter, has given his approval to this legislation that has been introduced by Representative Downing and Senator Tinnin and others down in the district, and I think that before the year is out we will probably see other operations in that area.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I mention in my statement, Mr. Jones, that it is because of the State legislatures in many instances that some of the States do not have it. That is the reason why in our State only St. Louis has the program. The State must pay part of the certification costs, et cetera, so it requires State cooperation.

The States with no food stamp projects are: Arizona, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Massachusetts—but this will soon start there—Nevada, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Dakota. All of the other States have food stamp projects. But I know that some of the State representatives and senators in Missouri have complained, "Well, we cannot get any interest among enough of our State legislators," and I said,

"Well, it took 10 years to interest enough of the Members of the Congress in it. I think that you have to do a selling job."

Even many Members of Congress just do not know what this program means. This program has been in operation on a pilot basis in some areas of the country since 1961. Members still ask: "What is it?" They have not taken the trouble to find out. When you start to tell them about it they are ready to go to some other subject before they hear the whole story. It is only when the people that you represent become involved, and you take enough trouble to find out what it is all about, that you get deeply involved. And when you do find out what it is all about, and how you can help and what you can do to make it better, that you become enthusiastic about it.

This is the reason I said, Mr. Goodling, that Members who do not have the food stamp plan in their districts are missing a wonderful experience.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kleppe?

Mr. KLEPPE. Mrs. Sullivan, I would like to follow up, if I may, just a little bit along the line of thought that Representative Gathings started. It has to do with this one sentence in here which says:

> Just remember that when economic conditions improve, many beneficiaries automatically go off the program; and as retraining programs succeed, and also our many educational opportunity programs, persons or families now eligible for food stamps will increase their incomes and leave the food stamp program for good.

I think that I understand correctly that those people automatically going off the food stamp program are those that reach a certain economic income level; is that correct?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. KLEPPE. The question I have is as to your last clause here which says "and leave the food stamp program for good."

Are you suggesting here that maybe the appropriations in the future for this food stamp program may be decreased?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. They could be, or they could be increased.

Just let me carry your thought one step further. If a family is not on welfare, the certification for that family's eligibility must be done every 3 months, so that when a family's income increases, it is known very quickly and their purchase requirements are changed; and if it increases above the maximum, then they do not receive any more food stamps.

Mr. KLEPPE. Is that not true, that whenever you have a program like this that gets started, it usually increases; it never decreases.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Well, if we should have an increase in the number of poor people in the areas where the plan operates, it will increase, yes; but in a program of this sort this is why the periodic certification is so necessary so that a person just cannot come in and apply and give an inadequate account of his income. And this certification is the function of the States. Sometimes they object because they feel that it is too expensive for them to certify the people who are eligible. But if they want the program, then they are going to have to pay to help do this part of the job.

The program will certainly increase in cost as we extend it to more areas—hundreds of areas are waiting for the program to start. It

started with eight areas and it is now operating in more than 650. They plan to expand it to 875 by the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. KLEPPE. Thank you. I was interested in your observation regarding the projection of this program for the future. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Burke?

Mr. BURKE. I am not too familiar with the general operation of this program. After the family is certified and it is determined that they are eligible, is a record turned in by the grocery that he has received so many stamps?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No. The family goes to wherever the stamps are issued—in most places there is a little food stamp office somewhere in the city.

Mr. BURKE. I understand that, but when they are certified, and if they want to give the stamps to somebody else, let us say for $1 or for some other reason, what would prevent that? How would anybody know that?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Because the stamps must be in the book. They may not be removed except by the grocer.

Mr. BURKE. There is no record kept by the grocer when he redeems the stamps for the groceries; is there?

How would you know whether these people were actually using their stamps for food?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The store manager usually knows the people using the stamps in their particular grocery. It is up to him to make sure that he sells them food only, and nothing else, in return for the stamps.

Mr. BURKE. Let me ask you another question.

The grocer has knowledge of that in the sense of those who receive stamps?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes, he usually knows his customers.

Mr. BURKE. Thank you.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am now told—I had forgotten—that they also carry a card of identification when they buy and use these stamps. They have a card of identification with their signature on it, and upon request they have to present this card. The regulations cover that point very strictly.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

If not, we are very much obliged to you, Mrs. Sullivan.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness will be Mr. Sisk from California.

Mr. Sisk has two bills before us on this subject.

We will be glad to hear from you now.

STATEMENT OF HON. B. F. SISK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to appear and to make some comments on the two bills which I have introduced.

With your permission, I have a very brief statement which I would like to have inserted into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The prepared statement submitted by Mr. Sisk reads as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. B. F. SISK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee today to discuss two bills which are pending before your committee, H.R. 1268 and 1269, which are two approaches to provide both the surplus commodity program and the food stamp program to those counties which may require them.

I introduced these bills, Mr. Chairman, because of problems in my district as brought to my attention by our welfare directors. It appears that a number of these directors are staying with the surplus commodity program in order to handle the emergency cases that arise primarily in the farm labor field. Since introducing these bills, I find that those responsible for the administration of the Food Stamp Act claim that most of these emergency cases can and should be handled. However, this is contrary to the regulations issued to the welfare directors in my area. Consequently, I hope that introduction of these bills will help to correct the problem administratively and can clarify the misunderstanding that now exists.

I leave up to this distinguished committee the question of whether or not the greater flexibility of my bills is necessary or not. I would hope that in any case, Mr. Chairman, the committee, by resolution or otherwise, would request that the Department of Agriculture, through its food stamp division, would mount a campaign throughout the country to these counties using the surplus commodity program, explaining the possibilities and benefits under the emergency clause of the Food Stamp Act. This is needed because many of the welfare directors are not aware of these benefits and how the program can meet the needs of their people.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the privilege of presenting my views.

Mr. SISK. Also I have a letter from the director of my Public Welfare Department in Fresno County, Calif., which I would like to make a part of the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The letter dated March 7, 1967 follows:)

COUNTY OF FRESNO,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Fresno, Calif., March 7, 1967.

Hon. B. F. SISK,
U.S. Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SISK: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the Food Stamp Act and particularly the amendments to it which you are proposing.

Although Fresno County has a large population of low income families, it has not been able to implement the Food Stamp Plan. This is primarily a result of provisions of the Act which prohibit the Food Stamp Plan to operate in areas engaged in the distribution of federally owned foods.

Fresno County is the center of a large agricultural valley. Farm labor is its largest single group of employees. Agricultural labor in this area, as you know, is featured by seasonal demands and area fluctuations. Farm work is also particularly sensitive to inclement weather.

To assist in meeting emergencies which arise without warning as a result of sudden unemployment, Fresno County has operated a Commissary. Federally owned foods and items purchased locally are distributed. This has made it possible for us to assist a large number of people on an immediate basis. If we were to discontinue the operation of the Commissary utilizing federally owned foods, our emergency obligations would continue. If the volume of emergency obligations remained constant and federally owned foods were not available for distribution, our costs would increase $750,000.00 annually.

This emergency program, however, does not solve the problem for the low income employed person and the public assistance family, both of whom need to increase their consumption of nutritious foods. In Fresno County, in my opinion, we need both the Food Stamp Plan and the opportunity to distribute federally owned foods.

H.R. 1268 in my opinion would be a most workable measure. I see no abuses which would arise under its provisions, but on the contrary, I would view it as being of great assistance to low income families in this area.

HR 1269 while of some assistance would be limited in its application to the migratory worker. The vast majority of farm workers in this area no longer migrate to an extent. They are seasonally employed and in the low income classification but they have established residence and are a part of our communities.

Both HR 1268 and HR 1269 demonstrate an admirable understanding of the needs of low income persons in this area. I commend you highly for your interest and your insight.

Please advise me if I can provide you with further information which will assist in an understanding of the need for these measures which you have introduced.

Cordially yours,

REED K. CLEGG, *Director.*

Mr. SISK. Thank you.

I would like to make a very few brief comments about the problem which I have encountered in my own district. I happen to represent a district in which the food stamp plan has not been used. I am one who has supported Mrs. Sullivan in her long effort to bring about the adoption of the food stamp plan. I voted for it, and have voted for the appropriations for it, to carry on the program.

I do want to say, basically, that the reports and the information that I have lead me to believe that the program is doing a very good job, particularly, in supplementing the diets of a great many people who do have incomes that are so limited that they need supplemental diet.

The two bills which I have introduced, Mr. Chairman, goes to the subject of distribution of federally owned foods.

We operate a commissary in Fresno County. It is a county of just under one-half million people. We distribute a substantial amount of food through that commissary, so-called surplus foods, plus certain supplements which are purchased by the county and added to that.

I have been talking to the director of my welfare department and to members of the board of supervisors about the food stamp plan for several years, because we do have those who are on very small incomes who certainly need supplements if available. The attitude has been that they did not feel that they could fit into their program.

The letter which I have just asked to be made a part of the record is from Mr. Reed M. Clegg, director, indicates a very strong support and desire for the food stamp plan. However, based upon the regulations, they have said to me—and I might say as late as yesterday by telephone—that the regulations which are in their hands at the present time, put out by the Department of Agriculture relating to the food stamp plan, simply makes it impossible for them to meet the needs of many indigent families, and by that I mean families at this particular time of the year who are solely without any income whatever, without some kind of a distribution program, and I would just like to cite briefly a couple of comments made by our director out there bringing into focus the problem, and it may be that it is a matter that can be handled, Mr. Chairman, somehow or in someway. We have not been able to handle it up to this point, and that is the reason I say there is need for these two particular bills.

I might elaborate: first, the two bills, very simply, would permit the distribution of surplus foods and the food stamp plan to operate simultaneously within a county. They are two different approaches.

One would make it discretionary with the Secretary, subject to a condition that might exist in which he would feel that it would be advisable.

The second would actually repeal the prohibition against the use of these programs in any county.

Now, if I might just briefly comment. From this letter, Mr. Clegg makes this statement:

> To assist in meeting emergencies which arise without warning as a result of sudden unemployment, Fresno County has operated a commissary. Federally-owned foods and items purchased locally are distributed. This has made it possible for us to assist a large number of people on an immediate basis. If we were to discontinue the operation of the commissary utilizing Federally-owned foods, our emergency obligation would continue. If the volume of emergency obligations remained constant and Federally-owned foods were not available for distribution, our costs would increase $750,000 annually.
>
> This emergency program, however, does not solve the problem for the low-income employed person and the public assistance family, both of whom need to increase their consumption of nutritious foods. In Fresno County, in my opinion, we need both the food stamp plan and the opportunity to distribute Federally-owned foods.

I simply wanted to call to your attention for your consideration these facts, and I understand, probably, it has been considered before, because I seem to remember some debate which occurred on the floor some 2 or 3 years ago, a discussion by my good friend and colleague, Mr. Jones of Missouri and this committee, I think, on this very subject in which we were discussing some of the problems with reference to the distribution of surplus foods to needy families, and the extent to which the food stamp plan might include that program.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to explain some of the difficulties which we have had and the rather strong feeling on the part of the welfare people and the members of the board of supervisors in my own area, that these two programs could work simultaneously to the benefit not only of those receiving some money but also for the benefit of the individuals who, in many instances, do not have a penny, some indigent family without residential requirements which would normally qualify for the normal welfare type of thing, and they simply have to be fed.

Of course, this is a concern which the county has and which the director has, that is, that if we gave up our commissary facilities, our distribution of surplus foods and went 100 percent to the food stamp plan, we could find ourselves in substantial difficulty which could substantially increase the costs within the county.

I appreciate very much this opportunity.

These two bills which I have mentioned are H.R. 1268 and H.R. 1269. It may be that those bills are not needed, if administrative changes could be brought about. I might just close by citing the figure which my administrator tells me was given to him very recently as the very minimum on which stamps could be purchased, and that was $22, that that was the lowest amount that was permissible in the purchase of stamps at the present time. Where he got the regulations, I do not know, whether they came through the normal channels of the regional office or the department in California. But, certainly, if that be true, there is no question but what it would be impossible to take care of a great many indigent families.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. You were not here yesterday morning?

Mr. SISK. Unfortunately, I was not here.

The CHAIRMAN. There was no reason why you should be.

But on yesterday morning we heard testimony of one Dr. Wiley, accompanied by Mr. Carl Rachlin and Mrs. Etta Horn, who raised the question that this program was unsound, because it required the individual to put up money. They seemed to suggest that rather than to hand out food that we should hand out cash to these indigent people.

In fact, I gathered that they felt that they should be given greenbacks rather than food because greenbacks are more—well, shall I say—flexible than food stamps. They made such a good case against your proposal that I thought that you should familiarize yourself with their arguments.

(Laughter.)

The CHAIRMAN. They are arguing in favor of your proposal, but they convinced me that I just could not go along with this sort of double-barreled handout with each hand.

Mr. SISK. If I could just comment. I do not know how much I missed by missing that testimony. Let me say as one who happens to believe very strongly that all able-bodied people should work for their income, and as one who does not believe—in fact, I might say that maybe I am getting on the record a little bit early with this. I am not in favor of a guaranteed income, believing that people should, if able, work for their living and should not be provided with handouts.

I certainly have no intention, in the legislation which we propose, to propose any such situation as that. The only situation in which we are involved is that we have some 3 or 4 months in what we call our rainy season in which we have a great many farm families—in fact, right now, we are feeding in Fresno County alone somewhere close to 2,000 families, 2,000 indigent families, as I understand of yesterday, are on the rolls. These are people who generally do farm labor work of one kind or another. And because of the rainy weather at this particular period of the year, these people are totally without income. They do go out and work when the weather is permissible and when work is available, and they earn some money. We know that in many cases particularly where you have one or two in the family working, maybe a family of seven or eight people, where their income they have in the summer months or in the fall dissipates rather rapidly. I am not advocating, let us say, any additional free handouts; I am simply seeking to supplement the income of a great many people who, because of the smallness of the amount that they receive do need food supplements provided in the food stamp plan. We have not used the plan before, as I say, basically, because our people have thought that it would leave them in a very serious situation with reference to this other situation.

So, as I say, maybe these matters could be worked out administratively, but so far we have not been able to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Abernethy.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Some sections of the food industry of America supported this legislation 2 years ago, but some objected, in that it

was doling out commodities. They argued that the program was taking business from them, that it was cutting in on their field of operation in selling food. I think this had some effect on acceptance of the legislation.

Mr. SISK. I think that you are right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As I understand you, Mr. Sisk, you would more or less set the idea aside and make food stamps and surplus food available; is that right?

Mr. SISK. Not to the same people, no.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You would still make it available in the same county?

Mr. SISK. Yes, that is true.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It seems to me you are proposing to put us right back where we were.

Mr. SISK. Well, I may say that maybe it does. I might say to my good friend from Mississippi, I do not necessarily see it that way. I support the food stamp plan I think, probably, for the same general reason that many others do, to get away from the so-called handout; it was to get away from that.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not think that you can get away from that when that food will be available, that the Government will continue to purchase this food. They are not just going to hide it; they will give it away.

If we have a food stamp plan in every county in the United States, this surplus food—although the Secretary said yesterday that there is not any surplus, there is bound to be. That food is going to be given away, and it ought to be. We cannot let it decay or destroy it.

Mr. SISK. Let me say that at the present time we have available to our commissary flour, rice, beans, peanut butter, lard or shortening, and canned meats.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You heard the testimony that there was no surplus.

Mr. SISK. I was pretty busy in the Rules Committe and I was not able to be here, I will say to my good friend.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is all. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brasco.

Mr. BRASCO. To my good friend, Mr. Sisk, if I understand you correctly, are you saying in a certain portion of the year there are a number of people in your district who do not make any money so that they cannot participate in the food stamp program by purchasing stamps or that they prefer to get the food directly; is that basically what you are saying?

Mr. SISK. Well—in other words, yes. There are times in the year when we have a substantial group of people who have absolutely no income of any kind.

Mr. BRASCO. So that they cannot participate for that reason?

Mr. SISK. Yes; to the extent that cash is required to purchase the stamps. And, as I say, maybe this could be cured administratively, but we do not have information that it can be, but at the present time to the extent that any cash would be required they would not be able to purchase these stamps and, naturally, they would not be in a position to participate in the food stamp plan, so that they ought to have some type of direct aid plan or else they will go hungry.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will you yield to me?

Mr. BRASCO. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think that that is a good argument, that there are people to whom the surplus commodities would be available were it not for the fact that in their county they have a stamp plan available, and, therefore, they cannot get the commodities and they are not able to buy the stamps.

Mr. SISK. That is right. This is exactly the situation that I am in. We do not, of course, have a stamp plan. I want to make that clear. I have three counties in my district which are basically rural counties in which we have a great deal of farm labor, and these people, you know, are out of work particularly in the rainy season. I recognize it as being a peculiar situation, particularly different from the cities or other urban areas. There are times when these people do not have one dime of income, because, at the present time, there is no unemployment insurance for farmworkers. They have no income, period. And, of course, we have to feed them, and we are doing the best we can in feeding them. At the same time we desire the food stamp plan.

The problem is such as I hope can be worked out where we can have the plan but at the same time not deprive these people the right to eat during that period in which they do not have one dime with which to purchase stamps.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Sisk, I take it then that other than the direct distribution program, your county has no means of assisting these families during the period that they are not able to work, because of conditions that apparently involve the weather which is not in their control?

Mr. SISK. I am sure that California has a substantial welfare program; I am sure that you know that. Here we are talking about people who are able to meet residential requirements, who are receiving money payments, aid to dependent children, and a variety of other things.

I do not have the figures before me, and I do not wish to get into an argument with any of the other States but I am inclined to think that probably California has one of the largest welfare rolls in America, and that we are going to great lengths to take care of our poor people through the actual payment of money. I am talking here about what we call emergency in many instances where they do not meet the residential requirements, where they are not on the welfare roll. We have a great deal of what we call migrant labor. I am sure that my friend is familiar with this. This is in the farming areas. This is the area in which we find ourselves in a very serious situation. These people would have to be fed in some manner. Of course, naturally, it is more economical to feed them with surplus foods as long as surplus foods are available, and, therefore, they simply hate to take on a program which would deny them the availability of these surplus foods which, as I say, we have used substantially over the years to meet these emergency needs.

Mr. BRASCO. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further questions?

Mr. BURKE. We have the same problem in my county of indigent migrants in the area when because of bad weather they do not have money. However, the county, ordinarily, takes care of programs such

as this. In other words, the State will take over after the county has given aid in the emergency and additional funds are provided if they are residents. I was wondering, in that direction, what your county does. Your county can enter into it. We have, at least, done so in our county strictly as a county program under the county welfare program.

Mr. SISK. We have a very substantial county welfare program running over $20 million—strictly county, separate and apart from the State. And, of course, as I read from the letter of the Director, we figure that there would be a difference in the cost to the county of somewhere between $750,000 and $1 million if they lose the use of the surplus foods. This has to do with county budgeting and the county's part of the welfare load separate and apart from the State.

Mr. BURKE. Then, the food stamp program would take the burden off the county, also, under ordinary local programs?

Mr. SISK. It would not if it required any cash to purchase the stamps. You would still have to take care of these totally indigent.

Mr. BURKE. I am talking about those that would be on the welfare program who have cash, but not to take care of these others. The county could step in on these migrant workers and handle them on other programs, under the surplus food program, where there is enough for them to do it.

Mr. SISK. They do not have to do that. As I say, they are doing this to a substantial extent now. Of course, our welfare load, so far as the county is concerned—and our basic tax load, as I recall, is somewhere between $20 and $25 million annually in one country—this is only in Fresno County. We carry at the local level a substantial load of direct welfare.

Mr. BURKE. And it is your thought, more or less, that the Federal Government should take part of the load off?

Mr. SISK. We are not asking that at all, because I see nothing in this about that. As I say, the Director here in this case and the Board of Supervisors and others that I have discussed this with simply felt that as long as there are surplus foods available to people, in their opinion it is a little ridiculous and I agree with them, not to make these surplus foods available to the extent possible.

Mr. BURKE. I agree with that. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. You would confine that to the foods which actually are surplus in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, because in the list that is now available, it does not contain some of the articles that you mention. We are buying rice and are paying cash money for some of these products.

Mr. SISK. I recognize that. Some of the items mentioned here, I am sure that the Department is actually buying with cash.

The CHAIRMAN. You would confine yourself to those which are actually in surplus and which we actually have in stock, without purchasing for this purpose.

Mr. SISK. I certainly would, because, as the legislation which I propose is written, of course, I think it owuld be in the hands of the Secretary and the Department, as to what commodities would be available through the surplus disposal program for surpluses. They could hold it exclusively to those items which are in surplus at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. May.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Sisk, in the Food Stamp Act of 1964, under section 4(b), it reads:

> In areas where the food stamp program is in effect there shall be no distribution of Federally-owned foods to households under the authority of any other law except during the emergency situation caused by a national or other disaster as determined by the Secretary.

Would this be determined as to the emergency situation by the Department of Agriculture, under this section of the law?

Mr. SISK. We have discussed it very thoroughly, and I might say, Mrs. May, we would not qualify. We could qualify if we had a sudden flood, if a couple of the dams broke up in the mountains. My friend from Washington is generally familiar with the contour of my area in which for 8 or 9 months we have to depend upon that water. If we had a flood which might be determined a disaster, which has happened, then I do not think that there is any question but that this would apply and we could receive help under it, but we could not, I think, and would not qualify under this, under the normal procedures which I have explained here having to do with the ebb and flow of labor in the wintertime, in the rainy season, sometimes as much as a month at a time where families depend primarily on pruning vines or pruning trees, doing certain types of work that we do out there, and they cannot do any work at all and would have no income. It still would not be a disaster type of an emergency. It is not like an earthquake or a great flood. It is an emergency to the person involved in it, but not an emergency that would be applicable under the law.

Mrs. MAY. A definition of "disaster" would not go to an emergency situation as to the number of people out of work.

Mr. SISK. That is right. This is the information that has been given to us, yes.

Mrs. MAY. This is the determination that you have had?

Mr. SISK. Yes.

Mrs. MAY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rarick?

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Sisk, we received information yesterday from a group that indicated they were an organization of welfare recipients. They passed out a pamphlet on their history establishing their so-called legal rights as welfare recipients.

They handed out a little booklet to all of the members of this committee, of their various organizations.

I wonder, sir, if you know that in Fresno County, your district, the welfare recipients are organized?

Mr. SISK. Yes, along with some other problems we have in California, I am familiar with some of these problems also.

Mr. RARICK. I was quite amazed that they came into the hearing accompanied by a lawyer quite national in repute, whose office is on Park Avenue in New York. And their spokesman was well dressed, and he had the title of "Doctor." It would indicate that there are quite a few people who are preying upon the impoverished and unfortunate citizens in our country.

I just wondered if you were aware of that.

Mr. SISK. Yes, I will comment on that. I might say that I believe that in California there is a statewide organization of this type, and

one of the concerns of some of us from California is to see to it that the Federal funds under the antipoverty program or any other program is not used, let us say, for organization expenditures. I might say that this is one of the problems that has caused some real concern.

I am aware of the existence of the attempt to organize these people. I recognize the concern that the gentleman might have, which we share.

Mr. RARICK. They indicated that they hold national conventions. Apparently, they are well attended by thousands of people.

I wonder whether these people who were assigned to speak are misleading the welfare recipients into using their food money to support such an organization.

Last week there was a legislative investigation by the House Un-American Activities Committee, and they turned up three people who were on the Federal payroll who had poverty grants. Of course, the gentleman yesterday denied that he was a member of the Lawyers Guild.

I think that in dealing with less fortunate citizens we should realize that they are being preyed upon by folks who are definitely not in this to help them feed people and return to the status of productive citizens. I just wanted to get that in the record.

Mr. SISK. If I can comment on that: I think that this is one of the most tragic developments of recent years. Unfortunately, we do have those vultures—and that is what I call them—who prey upon many of our poor and who distort and mislead a great many people and, actually, take from them the few dollars they have.

I think that is one of the real tragedies that we are faced with. I think that is something that we should take all care possible to try to guard against so as to not permit these same things to be possible at the present time.

Mr. RARICK. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

If there are no further questions, Mr. Sisk, we are very much obliged to you.

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to discuss this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. We are always very glad to have you before the committee.

Our next witness will be our own colleague, Mr. Joseph P. Vigorito, from Pennsylvania. He has a bill before us, H.R. 3817.

We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Vigorito.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VIGORITO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I must apologize to my colleagues on the committee that I do not have sufficient copies of my statement for each and every one of you. It will be part of the record, anyway; and I am sure that you will go over the record before you cast a vote on these bills.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity the committee has given me to testify before you today on behalf of my bill, H.R. 3817,

which would provide for fuller and broader participation by our senior citizens in the Department of Agriculture's food stamp and surplus food distribution programs.

In the middle of 1966 I realized the need for this legislation and introduced in the 89th Congress a bill which would have achieved this end. However, the large number of pending bills at the end of the second session prevented scheduling hearings on my measure.

I now feel that the need is even more urgent and I have, therefore, reintroduced my bill in the 90th Congress.

Briefly, what this bill would do, Mr. Chairman, is to make available to retired persons 65 years of age or over surplus food without recourse to the present means test. Federal regulations now state that eligibility standards set by a State have to be approved by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The State surplus food standards bear a direct relationship to each State's welfare standards. For example, in Pennsylvania, eligibility criteria for public assistance includes consideration of income and assets available to the household.

Unless the Department of Agriculture allows liberalization of the State public welfare standard to make eligible all retired persons without recourse to an examination into assets and income, the eligibility of retired persons to receive surplus food without a means test is impossible.

Therefore, after consultations with local and State officials and with persons in the Department of Agriculture, I have introduced the measure we are considering today. The only requirement for eligibility would be that if a person is 65 or over his income should not exceed $3,000 a year, and if there is a household of two or more persons 65 years of age or over, their combined income should not exceed $4,000 a year.

The 89th Congress made great strides in recognizing the plight of our senior citizens and we passed much milestone legislation designed to work to their benefit. However, we must all admit that more remains to be done. With modern medicine and health care, more and more persons are living longer than before. We have a responsibility to these persons, many of whom are barely subsisting on limited or fixed incomes that do not allow them to live out their lives with a measure of dignity.

All of us read with great interest President Johnson's message to the Congress of January 23 which dealt with the problems of our senior citizens. As he pointed out, today there are more than 19 million Americans 65 or older; a number equal to the combined populations of 20 States. One out of every 10 citizens is in this age group—more than twice as many as 50 years ago.

The President's message is 10 pages long, yet there are two facts that stick out among all others:

First, 5.3 million older Americans have annual incomes below the poverty level.

Second, nearly 40 percent—and I repeat—nearly 40 percent—of our single older citizens have total assets of less than $1,000.

There is a role for the Federal Government in this problem. A solution is possible. It is a proven fact that our senior citizens could benefit from legislation such as the bill I have introduced. Mr. Chair-

man, I would respectfully urge the committee give this matter serious thought and consideration.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to add that this bill has received widespread support. It has obtained the full backing of the Pennsylvania Brigade, Association of Retired Persons, and the National Council of Senior Citizens, located here in Washington, D.C. I believe that we have here today a representative of its national council willing to testify in favor of this measure. I would like to make part of the record of this hearing the following documents:

1. House Resolution 74, passed by the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, session of 1966, stating: "*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives urges the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture to explore every possibility to adapt and liberalize Federal regulations governing distribution of surplus foods to retired persons receiving social security," and so forth.

Mr. DOLE. Will you yield?

Mr. VIGORITO. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOLE. Does it say anything about the State paying any of the costs?

Mr. VIGORITO. No.

Mr. DOLE. They want to liberalize it with Federal money?

Mr. VIGORITO. The resolution is House Resolution No. 75, which briefly relates to Federal money available for Pennsylvania. What they really state here is that they want continued surplus food program and the stamp program, too.

They are very much in favor of it.

Mr. BELCHER. If you will yield?

Mr. VIGORITO. Yes, sir.

Mr. BELCHER. I am wondering whether with these State legislatures continuously memorializing the Congress as they do, whether the Congress should be permitted to memorialize them to do that in their own system?

Mr. VIGORITO. I think that is a good idea; I think that would be a shot in the arm.

I also have a brief statement from the City Council of Erie, Pa., which is in general agreement that senior citizens should participate to a greater extent in surplus foods and the food stamp programs.

And I also have a short statement here from the Senior Citizens Group in Erie, Pa., which I, too, would like to have included, which is for a better distribution of surplus foods.

I would like to state at this point that three counties which make up my congressional district all participate in the distribution of surplus foods. One county, as of the first of February this year, will now participate under the stamp plan, and the other two counties are to participate in the stamp program in the very near future, which I am very happy to hear, because I think that the stamp program is a very good program and is very convenient and helpful for everyone concerned. It gives our senior citizens a choice and selection of food.

I would like further to state that as long as this country can produce more food than we can consume, that there should be no one in the country going hungry.

I remember the day after the last election, November of 1966, as I was coming out of my house, a little old lady came up to me, and she said:

Mr. Vigorito, see what you can do for our older citizens so that we can improve our diets. We live on such a small limited income that we cannot eat what we would like to eat, or the way that we used to eat.

I do not believe that we should only dole out surplus foods, because we have a capacity to produce more food than we can possibly consume; we should produce and consume the food that this Nation needs.

I also have another statement here, Mr. Chairman, from Max Rosenn, Secretary of the Department of Public Welfare. I would like also to have that made a part of the record.

The income exclusion, it points out, for financial eligibility for surplus foods or food stamps is $110 a month for elderly persons—$110. If you make $111, you cannot participate in the surplus food and food stamp programs.

I believe that it should be more liberal than that, and that we have it within the jurisdiction of this committee in this Congress to see to it that our senior citizens can have a proper diet.

Thank you, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. You want to include all of these articles and resolutions in the record?

Mr. VIGORITO. Yes, sir; I would like to have all of them included.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, all five of them will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The documents referred to follow:)

[Printer's No. 445]

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 74, SESSION OF 1966

(Adopted by the House Tuesday July 12th)

INTRODUCED BY MESSRS. POLASKI, BELLOMINI, E. L. MURRAY, O'DELL, BLAIR, DWYER, HARTLEY, BENNETT, LUTTY, MEHOLCHICK, DONNELLY, SHUMAN, MRS. JONES, MESSRS. PEZAK, HETRICK, RENWICK, MURPHY, SCHMITT, J. K. K. SMITH, WILT, RIGBY, CIOFFI, TIBERI, SHELHAMER, PERRY, WISE, HANKINS, SHELTON, EMERSON, BRUNNER, SUCHKO, HOMER, ARMSTRONG, WILLARD, BACHMAN, MORLEY, KRADEL, STEMMLER, WELSH, OTTO, DAVIS, KESTER AND MRS. KERNAGHAN, JUNE 7, 1966

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES, JUNE 8, 1966

In the House of Representatives, June 7, 1966.

Retired persons receiving social security are eligible to receive surplus foods distributed under Federal legislation and regulations. However, in order to be eligible they must qualify under a means test establishing need based on State welfare standards.

In this Commonwealth, such standards involve net income and liquid assets and have been made as liberal as Federal regulations permit.

Nevertheless, retired persons receiving social security are in a position of hardship due to their fixed income and the constant rising cost of living; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives urges the United States Secretary of Agriculture to explore every possibility to adapt and liberalize Federal regulations governing distribution of surplus foods to retired persons receiving social security so as to take into consideration their position of need due to their fixed incomes and the impact thereon of the rising cost of living; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Secretary of Agriculture.

[Printer's No. 446]

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 75, SESSION OF 1966

(Adopted by the House Tuesday July 12th)

INTRODUCED BY MESSRS. POLASKI, O'DELL, BLAIR, DWYER, BELLOMINI, BENNETT, DONNELLY, SHUMAN, PEZAK, HETRICK, RENWICK, MURPHY, MEHOLCHICK, SCHMITT, LUTTY, E. L. MURRAY, HARTLEY, J. K. K. SMITH, WILT, WELSH, KESTER, MRS. KERNAGHAN, MESSRS. MARKOVITZ, RIGBY, CIOFFI, TIBERI, SHELHAMER, PERRY, WISE, HANKINS, SHELTON, EMERSON, J. J. ARMSTRONG, BRUNNER, SUCHKO, WILLARD, BACHMAN, MORLEY, KRADEL, STEMMLER, HOMER, MRS. JONES, MESSRS. OTTO AND DAVIS, JUNE 7, 1966

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES JUNE 8, 1966

In the House of Representatives, June 7, 1966.

The Federal Government, through the Department of Agriculture, has been providing funds for State participation in the Food Stamp Program. This program was designed to provide all needy persons with better diets and increased food purchases.

In this Commonwealth, the program is operational in only a portion of the counties although legislation has been enacted providing for participation by all interested counties and although some counties which are in favor of participation cannot qualify because of Federal requirements as to eligibility for the funds available.

There is only a specified amount of Federal money available for Pennsylvania for this program and the United States Department of Agriculture requires that as to its distribution, priorities among the sixty-seven counties be established on the basis of public assistance dependency ratios, the percentage of people on public assistance in relation to the total population.

Thus, in order that more counties desiring to participate may do so, additional Federal funds must be made available. The United States Department of Agriculture has requested additional funds for fiscal 1966–67; therefore be it

RESOLVED (the Senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to approve and, if possible, add to the increased funds proposed for the 1966–67 Budget of the Department of Agriculture for the Food Stamp Program so that funds for participation of all counties in Pennsylvania desiring to participate in the Food Stamp Program will be available; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS, ERIE, PA., MARCH 2, 1966

By Mr. Harkins, seconded by Mr. Scheffner

Resolved, by the Council of the City of Erie, That:

Whereas a large segment of our citizenry are persons who after decades of useful and productive labor are living in well merited retirement on fixed pensions, and

Whereas the increasing cost of living, in all fields, has trapped an overwhelming portion of these individuals in an ever worsening financial bind, and

Whereas through Divine Providence, and the aid of modern application of the sciences of agriculture, the farms of America are each year producing greater quantities of all type of crops, and

Whereas a great country such as our own, that has and will continue to export immense amounts of foods to the entire world, can and shall certainly do likewise for its own Senior Citizens, so therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Erie, Pa., That they call upon the proper officials of the Federal Government of the United States and of the Common-

wealth of Pennsylvania to make Surplus Food available to all those on retirement, including those individuals on 100% Social Security Disability, without recourse to any form of a "MEANS TEST", as one method of alleviating their financial stringency, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture and to Robert J. Freiler, Director, Bureau of Surplus Foods, Department of Property and Supplies, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

March 2, 1966. City Council adopt by yeas Messrs. Brabender, Cappabianca, Feehley, Glowacki, Kinter, Scheffner and Harkins. 7. Nays. 0.

March 2, 1966. Signed by the President. Attested by the City Clerk.

Signed March 2, 1966.

BERNARD J. HARKINS,
President of City Council.

A true copy.
Attest: March 2, 1966.

EUGENE GRANEY, *City Clerk.*

[From the Erie Churchman, July 1966]

RETIRED NEED HELP

The problem of the aged are many. Most persons past 65 are retired and living on fixed incomes, often extremely limited ones. Although personal exemptions for federal income tax purposes are doubled for those over 65, very few other concessions are made to the elderly. Some states provide property tax exemptions up to a certain level, and there are other scattered instances of token concession, such as forgiveness of per capita tax payment. But with relatively few exceptions, our retired elderly are caught in an economic squeeze.

The basic Medicare program, together with additional coverage available at nominal cost, has removed much of the fear the older people once felt about mounting medical costs, but they are still faced with the hard problem of making their money stretch far enough to provide basic needs, chief of which is sufficient food.

The Pennsylvania Brigade, Association of Retired Persons, has launched a campaign to allow retired persons to obtain surplus food without submitting to the "means test" required of those young enough to be considered still a part of the labor market. In this effort, they seem to have garnered the support of newspapers and most government officials. But so far, no concrete move of any official standing has been made, such as passing a new law or amending the old one.

If the elderly are in genuine need, why should they be reluctant to affirm that need through the standard means test? Here's how the Pennslyvania Brigade answers:

It's a matter of personal pride and human dignity. They spend their productive years working hard, earning, providing, paying taxes, contributing to the total economy, without ever having asked for charity. Now that they're beyond the productive stage, they feel they still should not be subjected to the humility of declaring themselves poverty-stricken in order to obtain a little help thru surplus food, which they maintain is available in huge quantities, and for which the government is hard put to find outlets—much of it, they say, goes to foreign countries, in addition to that provided the younger needy and various non-profit institutions. And in the absence of any other concessions to the elderly in Pennsylvania, they feel that opening the surplus food bins to the retired, thus freeing a few more of their limited dollars for other needs and comforts, is logical and justified.

There seems to be much merit in the Brigade's position. If there are some among the elderly who do not really need the help, is not the same thing true of social security? The Brigade feels that "policing" the program to prevent abuses would be more costly than the amount of food taken by those not in real need. After all, how many retired people would even accept government surplus food if they were perfectly capable of providing for their own wants?

An examination of the needs of the elderly is indeed in order. Our legislators should determine what, if any, tax exemptions might be instituted on their behalf. And certainly careful consideration should be given to eliminating, or

at least modifying, the means test in the case of the elderly seeking surplus food. (For further information, contact H. A. Swedenhjelm, 3322 Elliot Road, Pennsylvania Brigade, Association of Retired Persons.)

—J.E.D.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Harrisburg, June 23, 1966.

Hon. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VIGORITO: I appreciate your request for recommendations on Federal legislation to accomplish the aim of the various Erie County citizens groups to make surplus foods available to all retired persons without a means test.

Federal legislation establishing the surplus food and food stamp programs authorizes granting such food to the *needy*. Therefore, the United States Department of Agriculture requires that, to be financially eligible for surplus foods or food stamps, a person's financial means must be roughly comparable to the top amount of public assistance that a needy person can get in the State.

Since Pennsylvania's income and assets criteria for eligibility for surplus food and food stamps are among the most liberal in the nation, there are among the 440,000 needy persons now receiving surplus foods or food stamps in Pennsylvania large numbers of retired persons who are Social Security beneficiaries. The income exclusion point for financial eligibility for surplus foods or food stamps is $110 a month for the elderly person. Emergency or special circumstances are also recognized.

Since the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture are based on federal legislation, you may wish, if you agree with the proposals of the Erie County citizens groups, to introduce legislation to amend the present law so as to make all retired persons eligible for surplus foods, *regardless* of their means.

Since our Department's focus in this area is on needy persons receiving public assistance, we feel that legislation is also needed to increase the Federal Government's financial participation in States' Public assistance grants. Pennsylvania's allowances for elderly citizens are something under 90% of the cost of a minimum standard of health and decency; for all others, the allowances are less than 70% of the cost of a minimum decent standard. Higher assistance grants would enable needy elderly and other persons to buy more food and clothing, decent housing, household goods, etc. that they so desperately need.

In our experience in administering the food stamp program (in operation in seventeen counties in Pennsylvania, not including Erie County), we have found, on the whole, that this program is preferred to the surplus food program. In contrast with the surplus food program, the food stamp program leaves the choice of foods up to the individual; he is able to buy a greater variety of foods and have a more balanced diet; he can buy the food in community stores at times convenient to him rather than wait in line at special hours for food distribution; and, it benefits the business in the home communities by increasing the volume of trade at regular retail outlets. As you probably know, in the counties where the food stamp program operates, it replaces the surplus food program. I am enclosing a leaflet that briefly describes the food stamp program.

I should add, that some families with low income have found it a hardship to spend the amount of money they are required to spend for food stamps. (For example, a family of two with $100 net monthly income must buy $16 worth of coupons twice a month to get $8 worth of coupons free each time.)

I greatly appreciate your interest in improving the living standards of retired persons who must live on low pensions, social security, and old age assistance.

Please feel free to write me again at any time that I can be of service.

Sincerely yours,

MAX ROSENN, *Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions of Mr. Vigorito?

Mr. GOODLING. I want to be absolutely certain that I am reading what I think I am reading. You say you want the Secretary of Agri-

culture to distribute agricultural products to people over 65 years of age without reference to their personal needs or income——

Is that what you are saying?

Mr. VIGORITO. No, no, no. If you go on further it states that the income must be no greater than $3,000 per single individual or $4,000 for a couple.

Mr. GOODLING. That is in another section of the bill, is it not?

Mr. VIGORITO. Yes.

Mr. GOODLING. In other words, what you are saying on the first page of your bill is not what I have just said, is that correct?

Mr. VIGORITO. That is correct.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a limitation in another section of the bill referring to $3,000 and $4,000.

Are there any further questions of Mr. Vigorito?

If not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Vigorito.

Mr. VIGORITO. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Our next witness is Mr. Harry Graham, legislative representative of the National Grange. We will be delighted to hear from you now.

STATEMENT OF HARRY L. GRAHAM, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I had hoped this morning that since this was an area that deals with consumers and with children that we would have the time for Miss Boukalis to read the statement; however, since we are pressed for time, I will just take the opportunity to introduce her to you, because sometimes you are going to have the privilege of looking at someone besides myself when the Grange presents its testimony.

She is Miss Mary Boukalis.

And then let me summarize very quickly the statement in the interest of saving time.

The CHAIRMAN. Do not summarize it if she is going to read the paper.

Mr. GRAHAM. She is not going to read it. When we have more time, we will let her do that.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to have her do that.

Mr. GRAHAM. We would say, first of all, that Mrs. Sullivan's bill on food stamps has our hearty approval. And as to Mr. Vigorito's bill, we think the objectives are commendable, but we would like to see a price tag on that. It is pretty indefinite at the present time. Therefore, if he will bring that back in another year with a little more refinement it, we will be more happy to support it, Congressman Vigorito.

In terms of Mr. Sisk's bill, we think that in some way we must have some adequate provision for the migratory people. This has been a sticky problem all along. We all recognize that one. They do not stay any place long enough to get residency established, and yet they are very essential to our agriculture economy. After all, they are people with families.

I do not believe that all of the evidence used to justify this in Fresno County would impress me any more than, apparently, it has the chairman.

In the statement we have prepared here, I think it was modified a little bit, because the witness almost talked himself out of his position. Primarily, we should remember that even where there is relief provisions made such as in Fresno County, which is, incidentally, according to their chamber of commerce, the richest agricultural county in the Nation, with farm sales exceeding $1 million a day, where there is a cash welfare law that participation in the food stamp fund is a practical way of reducing the cash welfare loan, because otherwise they are furnishing them enough money for all of their foods, to participate in the food stamp plan, and the welfare department can do that if they want to do so. That is my understanding. They can enable the recipients to receive about four or five times as much food for the same amount of money. So, this one, with the exception of trying to provide some way of handling the migratory people, is one that we could not support.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, that is the position of the testimony that I will file with your permission.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Your statement will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The prepared statement submitted by Mr. Harry Graham follows:)

STATEMENT OF HARRY L. GRAHAM, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Food Stamp Act of 1964 was originally passed as somewhat of a pilot program and it, of course, had a termination date which is in 1967. It was anticipated that a number of states would want to use the program, but the requests for sharing in the program have exceeded original estimates, indicating the general approval of the operation of this program.

H.R. 1318 by Mrs. Sullivan properly puts the program on the basis that it is not to be terminated until specifically done by the Congress, allowing for the orderly programming and budgeting not only by the Federal Government but by the state and local governments involved.

At the same time, it provides for an expansion of the program on an orderly basis to cover the needs of those who are in the income brackets which properly and legally qualify them for receiving this assistance.

The Grange supported the original pilot project, we supported the Food Stamp Act of 1964 and we are happy to support H.R. 1318 to put this on an expanded and more permanent basis.

We urge this Committee to approve this bill and that appropriate action by the Congress should follow.

One of the concerns of the Grange as it has surveyed this and previous programs was that the Nation was dependent upon the distribution of "surplus commodities." These were purchased by the government at "support levels", far below a fair price to the producers.

The Food Stamp Program has brought the procurement of food into the regular market channels where the recipients have access to the same food available to others in our society. The dual results upgrading the diets by making essential foods available, and the normalizing of the market system for food distribution were and are commendable and worthwhile objectives.

As Under Secretary Schnittker said this week in a speech before the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, "The steady expansion of the Food Stamp Program is an important force in expanding markets. By the end of the current fiscal year, nearly two million persons will be involved. Much of the increase in spending for food will be for meat and other livestock products."

While we are in sympathy with the general thrust of the legislation introduced by Mr. Vigorito, H.R. 3817, we would prefer to delay our approval of this bill until the program has been expanded to the limit of its original objectives and until we have a rather accurate estimate of the costs involved in this proposal.

This bill has a further disadvantage against it at this time in that the surpluses of foods which were in such abundance in the original food distribution program are no longer available and we would prefer to wait until it becomes evident that we have food beyond our regular commitments for this surplus food distribution before we expand to the territory with which Mr. Vigorito is properly and commendably concerned.

Regarding the two bills introduced by Mr. Sisk, H.R. 1268 and H.R. 1269, which are designed to serve the same purpose, we would hope that the provisions for the distribution of government-owned foodstuffs in cases of national emergency and disaster would be covered under the present legislation. If there is need to clarify the right of the Federal Government to distribute surplus commodities in disaster areas where food stamps are also being used and if this proposal is necessary in the opinion of the counsel of the Committee or other legal experts, we would support the proposal.

A problem exists in trying to provide for the migratory people who do not live in one locality long enough to qualify on the basis of residence for the distribution of either surplus foods or food stamps. Certainly there are instances when these migratory laborers who are an essential part of the agricultural structure are in situations where they are unemployed temporarily and where it appears that some assistance is necessary, and, in many instances, vital to the health and welfare of the families involved.

If it is possible to cover this situation in a little more specific language, I think we would be more enthusiastic about supporting the proposal of the Congressman from California.

Perhaps, by granting the authority to the Secretary to determine when such distributions are necessary and what procedures should be followed, is as good an answer to the problem as we have, but we would hope that the Committee would direct its attention in its deliberations on these proposals to this problem long enough to ascertain whether or not this proposed legislation has the possibility and potential of accomplishing the worthwhile objectives concerning the distinguished Congressman from California.

We are of the firm conviction that nobody in this United States should be permitted to go hungry as long as there is an abundance of food available and as long as we have the great wealth this Nation so obviously possesses.

The problem of caring for the health and welfare of the families of migratory laborers has been one of the most persistent and most difficult to answer of all the problems we have had relating to farm labor. The plight of the migratory laborer is clear evidence that much still needs to be accomplished in this field.

In summary, the Grange supports the purpose of this legislation and would be pleased to support any refinements to the proposal this Committee might be able to develop.

One of the most beneficial and far-reaching bills passed by the 89th Congress was the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. This legislation brought the whole field of school lunch feeding and Special Milk Programs under one Act and gave it a permanence and stability it properly deserved.

It is not inconsequential to note in regard to the Special Milk Program, that this has probably done more than all of the rest of the promotional campaigns combined to make milk drinkers out of the present generation.

Your witness cannot drink coffee or any drink containing caffeine because of an allergy. On planes, it is usually possible to get a glass of milk, except on those flights where college students are in the majority such as at vacation time. There is never enough milk at those times to go around.

Some of my young friends tell how their fraternity houses limit the amount of milk per person since some of them would drink nothing else. At a time when we have a persistent dairy problem, the development of a new generation of milk drinkers, largely due to the Special Milk Program, is a heartening straw in the wind. It has always had our enthusiastic endorsement.

We are in agreement, however, with critics of the bill in that there are some loopholes that need to be cleared up in fairness to all of the children of the Nation who have an equal right to at least the minimal nutritional requirements for physical and mental growth.

We would propose to the Committee that ways and means be developed to make certain that all children be fed as a part of these programs. If a "means test" is to be used to determine if the children of poor parents should receive this food free, then it should be required that no method be used to differentiate between these children in such a way that the recipients of free food are made an object of scorn or ridicule.

We have heard of instances where different colored tickets were used for those who paid for their lunch, although no one really pays the full value as we all know, and those who received the lunch free. In at least one instance, two small girls did without the lunch rather than display the "blue" tickets contrasted to the "red" tickets of the others.

The purpose of the program is obviously circumvented in these instances and should be forestalled in the future.

The amendment which has been transmitted to the Congress, before this Committee, providing food services for children participating in group situations away from home, such as child day-care centers, settlement houses and day camps, would provide assistance for those children not yet in school and for those who are out of school during the summer months when no other food services are available.

This Committee has heard, I am sure, from more competent witnesses the scientific proof that malnutrition during the first four years of a child's life can seriously affect his learning ability through the rest of his life. The physical effects of inadequate nutrition can sometimes be overcome if a proper nutritional program starts early enough in the pre-adolescent years and is followed in adulthood. However, the damage to the learning capacity seems to be permanent and irrevocable.

In a Nation so committed to a War on Poverty, it would seem incredible not to attack this problem at its root source, namely children. We must provide every opportunity for children to learn the skills necessary to enable them to make a living later in life sufficiently high enough that they are not permanently committed to the poverty group. Therefore, we must not let a lack of feeding programs for children in poverty areas blight their chances for a successful and happy adulthood.

We may urge, and some do, that adults who cannot make a living for themselves may be lacking in initiative, or that there may be something lacking personally to make them efficient wage earners. Mental and emotional instability and the various factors are frequently brought before us. Some of these factors can be corrected and a tremendous amount of money is appropriated to do so.

The sad part of this story is that the children who are placed irrevocably in a poverty situation by malnutrition are the victims of circumstances over which they have absolutely no control. Their options are all closed. Their ability to make decisions has not yet been developed, and if they were made, could not be carried out.

Therefore, we believe that the Administration and this Committee is properly advised to give serious consideration to the amendment of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to expand these child feeding programs, to fund them properly, and to designate the means by which they may be administered effectively.

When this witness appeared before this Committee recently to discuss the problem of the possibility of mass starvation of millions of people in India, the gentleman from New York City who sits on the Committee properly raised the question about why we did not take care of feeding our own needy people. We promised him then that when this act came before the Committee, along with the Food Stamp Act, we would give as vigorous support to the attempts made to feed the American needy as we have to provide just a minimal requirement to sustain life in a land such as India.

I have never visited India and seen mass starvation, but it has been described to me by my friends who have been there. I do well remember, though, visiting with small group of people in the slum area of Knoxville, Tennessee, and seeing a mother trying to satisfy the hunger cries of a starving child out of a bottle of water. The picture of that tiny baby with bloated stomach and crooked lips being held by a distraught mother has been forever etched on my mind.

As the Bible so aptly reminds us, "If a man hungered, feed him"; for we shall be judged in the final analysis on whether we have fed him when he visited us in the form of a hungry child.

I do not feel I need to urge this Committee to adopt this legislation. Your concern and responsibility in this field has been amply demonstrated many times. What the Grange is trying to say to you today is that we commend you for what you have done in the past; we appreciate what you are trying to do at present; and we hope that your interest and concern in this field will continue in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions of Mr. Graham?

Mr. Brasco?

Mr. BRASCO. I have just one question. You said that you did not support Mr. Vigorito's bill, that you would like to see a price tag on it—which would be the giving out of surpluses. And here we are again becoming involved, because I asked the Secretary yesterday whether or not we had surpluses. And I still do not know myself. In the event there are surpluses which, apparently, have been purchased by the Government with the money of the people—the same people who at one stage of their life supported our Government through their tax dollars—the same people that Mr. Vigorito is talking about—you would not agree that this food should be given back to them if there are surpluses?

Mr. GRAHAM. What we are doing, Mr. Brasco, at the present time, is that what surpluses there are are being distributed through institutions that are also needy institutions. So, we are doing that. We really do not have very much surplus. We do have a problem developing in milk, but I would not object to that one. But by the same token, what I am trying to say is that until we get this food stamp program a little better established and more generally acceptable, making substantial exceptions to it, it seems to me to make only something that complicates the problem that we are trying to solve at the present time, and this is more my concern than the other.

They do qualify for food stamps if they come within certain means tests, and Mr. Vigorito has put a means test on it. He just put it high.

Mr. BRASCO. May I ask you this, then, Mr. Graham: You appeared, if I remember correctly, and testified on the food for India program. Is that correct?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRASCO. Was that surplus that went to India?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not all of it; no.

Mr. BRASCO. But some of it was surplus?

Mr. GRAHAM. What has gone in the past was surplus; what is going in the future will not be surplus. I do not think that very much that can be purchased will be at the support price level to go to India.

Mr. BRASCO. But if there is surplus, would you support Mr. Vigorito's bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly; we supported both the food stamp and the food distribution plans. We prefer the food stamp plan. It gets away from some very sticky problems that we have had in the other.

The food is going to be used that way, too.

We are not in favor of giving away food—it is not that; what we are talking about at the present time is trying to make the program work that we have started that has certain limitations that seem to be reasonable at the present time; and with all of the sympathy that we have for our elderly people, I do not know that we are justified

in making the exception to allow a single person with $3,000 income to receive surplus foods if he is over 65 years of age, or two people who have $4,000 income; if it is a mother and a child, the limitation would be much lower. This is the very issue which is of concern.

Mr. Brasco. What has occurred to me, with all due deference and respect to my colleagues on this committee who represent the farm areas, it seems to me that again I am here in an area of being naive, coming from the city; but it seems to me that what we are saying is that the Government is supporting a lot of these farm programs with the moneys, the public moneys, but when it comes to supporting those people in this country who need food with surpluses, every time I ask this question: Do we have surpluses or do we not have surpluses? it seems to me that the farm people become concerned about the fact that you might destroy the market by giving it out. They are getting it from both ends and protecting themselves; and the people are getting it from both ends. What they give in to the Government, the Government purchases from the farmer—they cannot get it; at least, the needy cannot get it back; and it seems to me, unless I am wrong, that this is a type of a circle that we are traveling in. I do not know that it is the proper approach.

Mr. Graham. May I comment to say that I think that this may appear to be a circle to you, but it does not appear to be to us; because what is really involved here is that we are going to do both for the same people, and whether or not we should have both programs for the same people.

Mr. Brasco. I do not see much difference.

Mr. Graham. It will make much difference, because it will double the gifts to some people where they are in certain circumstances; and to other people it would be denied, one-half of it.

What we are saying is this: We are not arguing about any limitation on the amount that is used. We would support whatever budget you bring out; but we are saying: Let us do it in fairness to all, to all needy people at the same time. The market has nothing to do with this.

Mr. Brasco. It does not apply to that—it is to extend the market.

Mr. Graham. We would rather take and use it here. We have always supported the use of the food here. There has not been any change in that. This is generally true of most of the farmer organizations. We have been at this for many years, to get surpluses distributed. It became very sticky, and the food stamp approach seems to be a much more logical and easier way of handling this problem.

Mr. Abernethy. Will you yield?

Mr. Brasco. Yes, sir.

Mr. Abernethy. What will we do with the surplus if all areas get food stamps?

Mr. Graham. I think that we have plenty of use for them generally, in institutions.

Mr. Abernethy. What will happen to the surplus?

Mr. Graham. For the amount of surpluses that we have at the present time——

Mr. Abernethy. In your judgment, would the food used in all of the colleges, the hospitals, and the other institutions such as orphanages, and the like, consume it?

Mr. GRAHAM. That type of thing.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You do not really mean that? Do you?

Mr. GRAHAM. When you apply it to the school lunch program, I do. I hope I am right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I hope that we are right; but we all know that you are not right, and I think you know that.

Mr. GRAHAM. At the present time we are not plagued with that many surpluses that we have to worry about it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. With all due deference, you do not say that there is no surplus of food in this country, do you?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not saying that—there is no great abundance.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What about——

Mr. GRAHAM. What I am saying is that they are purchasing this from the market in order to do it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Oh.

Mr. GRAHAM. Which commodity are we purchasing?

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentlemen this morning were speaking of flour and cheese and the like.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a small quantity.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I realize that it is being purchased, not because it is surplus. It is purchased in order to firm up the market. It is not being purchased necessarily to be distributed. It is being purchased for the purpose of firming up the market on our agricultural commodities.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are saying that we do not object to that approach in the areas where it is being used; we support that.

What we do object to, is doing it both for the same people; doing it twice.

Mr. BRASCO. You said that there was a sticky problem that the food stamp program took care of. What was that sticky problem?

Mr. GRAHAM. There were numerous questions in terms of the distribution, but the worst of them was that this was handed out on the basis of what was available instead of on the basis of what was needed. If they had an extra 10 pounds of cornmeal they would give that out when maybe the recipient already had 40 pounds of cornmeal in the house. So, it did not have any relationship much of the time to the need. It was more related to the surpluses. The need is more important than the surplus that was available.

Mr. BRASCO. It seems to me that what we are doing—I agree with my colleague, Mr. Abernethy, that this is being purchased to support the market. It seems to me that the farm people would rather have the Federal Government get into an area and give out money again so that what is on the market can be purchased, without giving it to the people; that is, these commodities. And it seems to me further that it is sort of a double type of subsidy, in effect, if that is what it is, and that we should then say that instead of going around in a circle, we should call it what it is. I do not understand that whatever the Government purchases with public funds to support the market in any way—I do not know why it should not go back to the needy people in this country without any question, without any sticky problem, or anything else.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I, in reply to that, ask you a question?

In the areas that have food stamps only, that they also could have surplus foods made available to them on the same basis as in areas that do not have the food stamp program?

Mr. BRASCO. I would say this, that obviously, the surpluses would not be the type of commodities or products that people could live on or that we would want them to live on. And I think that the one would balance the other. You would have the food stamp program for those things that were necessary, but those things that we have in surplus I would think that we should let the people have them, and then pick up with any other kind of program that you want to use to implement. I think it is about time that we started to support ourselves and those people in our country who need it, particularly when the American public is paying for it, rather than sending it all over and having people coming in with their problems. I agree that there are people in the world who are less fortunate than we are, but I think that in this case charity should begin at home. I would like to see one time when we have our own needs taken care of first, and then be concerned with some of the other problems that arise all over the world.

I do not understand all of the intricacies of the agriculture problem. I think it is a question of dollars and cents. Since I have been here, that whole thing has never made any sense to me. No one has ever been able to explain it to my satisfaction.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is not an inconsequential operation or appropriation that is being considered in terms of the total food stamp program, food lunch, and the like. This runs up to a very large appropriation. On top of that is the welfare appropriation which, in total, runs some $6 or $7 billion, so that we are not, really, neglecting too many people. This is a choice of how you are going to do it, and this is what we say about it.

Again, I say to you: As to the level, we are not questioning that; we are questioning the duplication where there is an unnecessary duplication, and we are questioning that. If the committee wants to hold hearings on surpluses this probably is not the time, but basically, we have three commodities that we are purchasing at the present time: one is orange juice from Florida to take care of an extremely heavy glut in Florida. They are purchasing modest amounts of canned pork and of boneless beef. They are purchasing some milk. These are the four commodities that are being purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation at the the present time.

If we are going to depend upon that for an adequate diet, it is completely inadequate, of course. But, again, most of this is purchased in terms of their obligation and confinement to the programs already in existence, so that this, really, is not a lot of extra available food at this time. It is an entirely different situation from 5 years ago when we would have been talking a different language there. We are in a different situation. We all realize that.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

If not, we are very much obliged to you and thank you so much for your cooperation this morning.

Our colleague, Mr. Saylor, of Pennsylvania, is with us and wants to be heard on some phase of this matter. We will be delighted to hear from you now, Mr. Saylor.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

I appear here in support of legislation introduced by my colleague, Mrs. Sullivan, to remove from the present food stamp plan the provision in section 16 which will expire on the 30th of June this year. As the members of this committee know—and I believe my memory serves me correctly—it was in 1955 when our colleague, the Representative from Missouri, offered an amendment to what is now Public Law 480 which would have amounted to the initiation of the food stamp plan.

As a matter of hindsight, I can tell the members of this committee that while she received support on her own side of the aisle, the lone member who stood up on the Republican side was myself. I did it, because I had discussed this matter with Mrs. Sullivan and people in my district and I knew the manner in which surplus foods were being handled, not only in Pennsylvania but in other areas. Information had come to my attention where they were used recklessly, were being wasted, and some new plan had to be devised.

When, as an experimental plan, this food stamp program was enacted, I was fortunate enough to have the Secretary of Agriculture pick Cambria County, of my home district, as one of the original counties where the plan would be placed into effect.

I can tell you that in an area where food had not only been wasted but had been pilfered, and used for illegal purposes, we have now realized one of the best distribution systems that I believe exists, anywhere in the country, and that is the food stamp plan.

As you know, the General Accounting Office made a survey in Pennsylvania, and they picked out three counties. They have determined that anywhere from a low of 21 percent to a high of 51 percent of the people who are receiving surplus foods, where there is no food stamp plan, are not eligible under any standards which the State or anybody else has put into effect.

If this provision is removed, I believe that it will not only be to the benefit of the entire country, but to everyone, that this food stamp plan be made available where wanted throughout the length and breadth of our land. It would enable people who are handling relief in the various States to provide real benefits to the people.

I can tell you that as a result of a telephone call to the man who has charge of the relief agency in my district that he has stated if there is any one thing that has assisted the people in Cambria County to improve themselves, it has been the food stamp plan.

I certainly hope that this committee in its wisdom will remove the limitation of the present law and see to it that the plan will have broad application in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Saylor. We appreciate your good endorsement on this food stamp plan.

Are there any questions of Mr. Saylor?

If there are no questions, we appreciate your attendance and thank you.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for permitting me to appear before this committee this morning.

(The following statements and letters were also submitted to the committee:)

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

The proposal to extend authorization for the Food Stamp Program affords a welcome opportunity to express my strong support for a program which has enjoyed outstanding success among the people of my district.

My experience with this program dates back to November 1, 1962, when a county in my district became one of the first designated Food Stamp outlets on a pilot basis. It was, frankly, experimental in the beginning and the program was viewed with some doubt by those who were first eligible. The program originally served primarily the long-term unemployed who had exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits and were subsisting on welfare or direct relief payments.

In a situation of this kind it is the family relationship and the children which suffer most. These families with unemployed breadwinners had been receiving surplus agricultural commodities in quantities which permitted them to avoid starvation but failed to meet even the minimum dietary requirements for growing children.

The introduction of the Food Stamp Program marked a pronounced change in the outlook of all who are concerned with the problem. There was a noticeable increase in the general health and alertness of the children. Many school teachers and principals have so stated this in letters to my office.

There was a general betterment of the environment prevailing in the home. It became possible to plan meals and to present a certain variety of foods. This helped to re-orient the young people toward the home.

But the most important accomplishment, in my opinion, was the demonstration of a technique which removed the pervading fear that bad nourishment among the children of the unemployed would make them unfit to participate in full citizenship and would automatically condemn them to unemployment themselves in later years.

When legislation was proposed in 1964 to establish the Food Stamp Program on a permanent basis, I supported the bill enthusiastically because I had received from the people of my district nothing but praise for the results obtained from the pilot projects.

I have seldom experienced a Federal program which enjoys more broad-based support. Not only public officials and specialists in the welfare field, but teachers, school administrators, ministers and spokesmen for both merchants and civic organizations have gone on record with their strong support. During the past three years the program has been extended to cover all five counties in my district, and I have yet to hear of a major complaint against its operation or administration.

During the past three years unemployment has been drastically reduced in the coal-field areas where the Food Stamp Program has been installed but I like to think that we have pioneered a method whereby the bounty of this nation can be administered to a constructive purpose and can be made synonymous with hope. Today there is less need to assist the technological unemployed in the coal fields but what we have learned can be readily adapted to the needs of the disadvantaged anywhere in this country.

In 1962 when one of the first pilot counties was established in West Virginia, there were 14,051 persons participating in the Food Stamp Program and stamps of a total value of $2.8 million were disbursed. During the years 1963–1965 there were four West Virginia counties dispersing Food Stamps with an average of 30,000 participants and stamps valued at about $5.5 million were disbursed annually. In Fiscal Year 1966, 18 counties in West Virginia were involved in the program, 72,500 participants and stamps with a value of $10.7 million were distributed. During the first six months of the current fiscal year operations have continued at approximately that same level.

In my own Congressional District, as of January, 1967, there were 21,300 participants in five counties and Food Stamps to the value of $372,976 were disbursed.

The record of operation verifies the fact that this is a balanced program which meets an established need and at the same time contributes to prospects for individual and family betterment. From an administrative standpoint, complaints have been negligible. Any impartial analysis of the results achieved, as measured against the cost involved, must conclude that the program is one of the wisest investments in the future development of our citizens which we have undertaken in recent years.

I urge, therefore, that the program be continued and expanded through passage of H.R. 1318 and I hope the Committee will act favorably on this proposal at an early date so that there will be no interruption of the service which would otherwise terminate in July.

STATEMENT OF REUBEN L. JOHNSON, DIRECTOR OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICES, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. I want to thank the Chairman and Members of the Committee for this opportunity to present the views of the National Farmers Union on the Child Nutrition Act and the Food Stamp Act.

The 65th Convention of National Farmers Union was held March 12th to 15th in Oklahoma City, Okla. The traditional and historic position of National Farmers Union was re-affirmed in the action of the delegates to urge "extension and expansion" of the Food Stamp and School Lunch Programs which the bills before the Committee provide for.

First, let me comment on the Child Nutrition Act.

In January of this year, Dr. Carl Hansen, Superintendent of Schools for the District of Columbia incurred the wrath on February 7th of many working mothers in Washington, D.C. because he did not announce whether or not schools would be closed that day because of snow and consequent road conditions until 8 a.m. that morning. The storm of protest because of this delay in making the announcement was so great that Dr. Hansen was forced to make a statement as to why he had delayed until 8 a.m. He said, "14,000 children in the District of Columbia rely on the hot meal they receive under the School Lunch Program for their only hot meal of the day." Dr. Hansen knew how much this meal is looked forward to by so many Washington children and he disliked depriving them of this nourishing, satisfying meal unless absolutely necessary.

If the need for the winter time school lunch is so great in the shadow of the nation's capitol, it is not difficult to imagine what it means to children living in the depressed areas of our country.

What happens to these children during the summer months? A hot dog and a "coke", a box of Cracker-Jacks or another "jelly sandwich" these are the lunches of the child left to make his own menu choices.

Yet the summer is the re-building period for children; a period of growth, exercise and in most regions of our country, of excessive heat . . . all factors which demand good nutrition—balanced nutrition—if the child is to face the winter months in the best physical condition.

This bill will let the recreation departments of the big cities as well as the non-profit institutions in rural areas, care for the needs of these children during the summer months. Some recreational centers at the present time set aside one day each week for a "cook-out" where the children bring food from home and the instructors "cook" the child's hot dog or hamburger but most children come with a "jelly sandwich" just for the thrill of eating outside at the recreation center with other children because most of them have working mothers and an empty house at noon-time.

Providing the wherewithal, the food, the equipment and help necessary to make this mid-day meal one of balanced nutrition and body building foods will meet with great enthusiasm on the part of children and instructor alike.

Another very important provision in this legislation allows the feeding of the pre-school child. It cannot be stressed too strongly the importance of balanced nutrition in the very young child. Permanent physical and in some cases mental damage can occur through malnutrition during these early body building years.

The National Farmers Union feels that there is no more important way to utilize the resources of our Nation than to expand the programs for the nutritional needs of the young people of this Nation. These efforts should be made without regard to the financial status of the parents. The National Farmers Union has long supported legislation in Congress on these needs. We urge that adequate funding be made available to meet the needs of our children, and that the legislation be passed through the Congress so that the program may go into effect in as many areas as possible this summer of 1967.

I turn now to the Food Stamp Act.

The National Farmers Union has watched the progress of the administration of the Food Stamp Act during this trial period and we feel that it is worthy of continuation and support. We strongly urge you to approve Mrs. Leonor Sullivan's bill, H.R. 1318 in which the ceiling on the appropriations for the Food Stamp Act is eliminated. We agree with the Secretary of Agriculture when he states in reference to the Act that, "a solid base has been laid for further progress in the immediate years ahead," to reach low-income families and provide them with better nutrition.

Recognizing needs of the Nation's poor for cotton clothing, white cotton goods and cotton mattresses, the delegates called for a "*market-basket food and clothing program to include cotton mattresses.*"

Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose an amendment to H.R. 1318 to provide for inclusion of the above cotton goods in the Food Stamp program. This inclusion of the program would help put to constructive and worthwhile use our cotton carry-over and besides that would fill an urgent need of low-income families.

In closing, we would like to thank all those dedicated employees and many volunteers who are making possible the effective use of the foods without which the programs would not be the success they are.

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE MITCHELL, DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON BUREAU OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

The Washington Bureau, NAACP, has received a large number of inquiries and comments on the administration of the Food Stamp Program from its branches and members. All of our correspondence indicates concern with the present administration of the program.

Because of the conditions occasioned by the switch from surplus food distribution to the food stamp plan in many counties of Mississippi, correspondence from that state is especially heavy. The gist of this correspondence is that the administration of the program under existing rules and regulations makes it impossible for many persons now receiving surplus food to participate in the food stamp program. We are advised that a recent study shows that literally thousands of Mississippi citizens who received surplus food are not now receiving food stamps. Because the economic factors that prevail in this state exist elsewhere, it is obvious that this same condition will result as other areas adopt the food stamp program.

The rigid regulations now enforced that make a family purchasing stamps devote a large percentage of its income to food stamps and also require the purchase of stamps on a regular basis often defeat the objective of feeding the hungry poor. Those most in need often have little or no cash on hand. What is available must often be budgeted to meet other necessities. Emergency situations often divert income so that regularity in the purchase of stamps becomes an impossibility. Thus, in many instances, the program becomes unrealistic as a method of assisting the needy. We believe that Congress can cure these defects and do so without the necessity of making a hard choice between distribution of surplus foods and the food stamp program.

We urge the Congress to direct those administering the stamp program to authorize the free distribution of food stamps to families who are entitled to governmental assistance. Beyond this, these families should be permitted, on a voluntary basis, to purchase additional stamps in such amounts and at such time their needs require and their income permits. Other persons now eligible for surplus food distribution, but not entitled to direct financial assistance, should be permitted to accept the food and, at their option, purchase food stamps.

We believe that such changes in the law, supported by the necessary Congressional appropriations, would represent significant progress in helping the needy to obtain a more nutritious and satisfying diet.

[Telegram]

Washington, D.C., March 17, 1967.

Hon. Bob Poage,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The National Association of Wheat Growers wishes to record support for the extension of Food Stamp Program and Child Nutrition Act.

C. Allen Tom,
President, National Association of Wheat Growers.

American Farm Bureau Federation,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1967.

Hon. W. R. Poage,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Poage: The American Farm Bureau Federation is very much interested in the legislation to extend the Food Stamp Plan.

The Farm Bureau policy on this issue is as follows:

"The government food stamp plan, started in 1961 on a pilot basis, has been expanded to include a number of additional areas. It has not increased food consumption significantly. Instead it has transferred a part of the total cost of food for relief distribution to the federal government. While we recognize that there are some people in this country who need diets with higher nutritional standards, we do not believe that it is the responsibility of the federal government to distribute free food to improve dietary standards through a government food stamp plan. We are opposed to any food stamp plan."

We would appreciate this letter being made a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

John C. Lynn,
Legislative Director.

National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.,
New York, N.Y., March 21, 1967.

Hon. William R. Poage,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
U.S. House on Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Poage: The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., as an agency for cooperative witness and service of thirty-four Protestant and Orthodox Churches in the United States, appreciates this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives its concern for the disadvantaged in the state of Mississippi.

The National Council of Churches operates an extensive mission and service program in Mississippi entitled "The Delta Ministry." Daily contact with scores of the most poor indicate to us that a crisis is impending. A particular problem has arisen in the anticipated changeover from food commodity distribution to the food stamp plan. Although the food stamp plan has much to commend itself, under the present guidelines it would work an undue hardship upon those who have no cash to purchase the stamps.

As was indicated in the directive to us, the National Council of Churches wishes to have entered into the record the accompanying testimony.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Henry A. McCanna.

Testimony to the Committee on Agriculture of the U.S. House of Representatives on the Food Stamp Program

100,000 more people in Mississippi will be out of work in 1967, according to the noted USDA analyst, Dr. Calvin Beale of Washington, D.C. This loss of work is a result of further mechanization in cotton. Many of those out of work will be permitted to remain on the plantations, but will have no cash income. The projected changeover from the distribution of surplus commodity food to the purchase of food stamps will result in further suffering for the multitudes of the poor in Mississippi. Unless cash is provided or the payment waived, the

people will go hungry. To protest this inequity, a rally of 800 people occurred in January, at Cleveland, Mississippi. During the Week of March 13, Mr. Neil Carter of the USDA Consumer and Marketing Service, Greenwood, Mississippi, heard testimony from more than twelve families in Tallahatchie County to the effect that they, and scores of their neighbors, had no cash to purchase food stamps.

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. has consistently expressed its concern for public assistance programs. In a policy statement adopted by the General Board on June 4, 1958, it was stated:

"The primary objective of public assistance programs is to furnish monetary assistance to persons in accordance with the determined degree of their economic need.

"For the people dependent on all of these programs there is universal need for an improvement in the standards of assistance so that health and decency may be maintained. The churches have a vital role to play in raising these standards, and churches need to work for the elimination of all inequitable and punitive policies."

Many of the counties in Mississippi that are starting the food stamp program have not told the poor people about it. They are just signing people up when they come to get commodities. And they are not explaining to poor people how the program works. Six counties began the stamp program in January and eight more are scheduled to begin in February and March.

In some counties poor people are being told they will lose their welfare checks if they do not sign up for food stamps. A very bad part of the program is that people must pay for a month's stamps all at one time. Many people do not have that much money together at one time.

Some people who will be buying the food stamps are not asked if they want the program. In many counties people do not even know their county supervisors have voted to have a stamp program.

Some county supervisors want the food stamp program because it does not cost the county as much money to operate as the commodity program does.

Also, many businessmen and store owners want food stamps because they will make much more money if poor people have to buy food at stores rather than getting commodities.

People who have seen the food stamp program in action say that these things sometimes happen:

Store owners sometimes accept stamps only for the most high-priced brands.

Retail prices often are raised on the days when stamps are being traded.

Public meetings to explain the program to poor people are not held as the federal government says they should be.

County supervisors do not tell poor people that they have voted to have food stamps instead of commodities.

People are told they will lose their welfare checks if they do not sign up for stamps.

The *Delta-Democrat Times* of Greenville, Mississippi, indicated in an editorial on September 29, 1966, a reservation on the food stamp plan:

"We have a serious reservation about the adoption of the food stamp program in Washington County. It is: What happens to the people who are so poor that they cannot afford to purchase even the small percentage of stamps which qualifies them for further free stamps? When the food stamp program goes into effect here this winter, the men who run food stores are going to be benefited. The people who usually come to the commodity house to be issued food because they haven't the money to feed themselves will instead be going to county stores, using stamps for money. But what about those who can't afford to pay the minimum cash price necessary for participation in the stamp program? As we understand it, there is a sliding scale which determines the amount of money the stamp buyer must lay out to get his quota of stamps. This varies according to his income and the number of people living off if. But there is the necessity for the person who is receiving stamps to contribute some money. Supervisor Fred Neal of the Fourth (Leland) District is the supervisor in charge of the commodity program which will be replaced by the food stamp program. A reporter asked him how people who had no money at all could buy stamps so they could have something to eat during the winter months. His answer: 'They don't.' Neal said he thought most people living on farms in the county would probably be loaned enough

money so they could purchase the stamps. But there is a large pocket of people living within the city limits of Greenville who have virtually no income. How are they going to manage? 'I don't know,' Neal said. 'They'll have to manage some way.' There are two points to be made here. First, no man who calls himself a Christian can permit another man to go hungry. Second, this program may turn out to benefit only the merchants in the county and not the people who need the help most badly. We think the board of supervisors should take a close look at the program and decide whether or not it will not do more harm than good. We originally thought it would be a good thing. Now we are not so sure. People must eat."

Many poor people in Mississippi, and the Delta in particular, cannot participate in this program because they do not have money. With commodities cut off they will not have any food. Alternatives include:

Providing a given amount of free or bonus stamps to people under a certain income. A return to a program providing free commodities to people who need them. An integrated staff at all levels, whatever the program. In counties with food stamps, commodities issued to the very poor under the emergency provisions of the food stamp law; certainly an emergency exists. Strict adherence to the guidelines by management and store owners, with the burden of enforcement, not upon the recipients, but upon the Federal and State agencies.

Desegregation of county welfare offices which, as part of these programs, receive Federal money and are in violation of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The General Board of the National Council of Churches, on December 9, 1960, in a resolution on "Ethical Issue in the International Age of Agriculture," concluded:

Our Lord taught his disciples to pray, "Give us this day our daily bread." Christians should continue to seek to achieve the goal implied in this prayer by breaking the barriers which persist between agricultural abundance and human need. Through their informed and sustained efforts toward this high goal Christians will thereby serve Him who provides and cares for His children everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. We had thought that might have an executive session this morning, but the hour is late. We have for consideration these bills at our next session. We will also have a resolution presented by Mr. Abernethy's subcommittee for consideration at the meeting which will be held tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. So, we will have an executive session of the full committee in this room at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. GATHINGS. The Subcommittee on Oilseeds and Rice, Mr. Chairman, also has a bill that was reported out the other day.

The CHAIRMAN. We will take it up then, with the other bills, Mr. O'Neal's subcommittee bill. That will be up for consideration, too, tomorrow morning.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I notice that we are scheduled next for REA hearings. It seems to me that the chairman should look into this matter. We will recess about Wednesday, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The schedule is to recess on Thursday. That announcement has been made, that we will recess on Thursday.

Mr. O'NEAL. At the close of business, Thursday.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. The Congress will be in session, according to the announcement made by the leadership by both parties.

The committee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon, the committee adjourned.)

FOOD STAMP APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION

PLEASE RETURN TO USDA
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY
LAW BRANCH, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING
Rm. 117-E, Admin Bldg.
Wash. D. C. Ext. 4654

HEARING

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETIETH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 953

A BILL TO AMEND THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS SUBSEQUENT TO THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967

APRIL 25, 1967

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
78-504 WASHINGTON : 1967

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana, *Chairman*

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Florida
JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi
HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia
B. EVERETT JORDAN, North Carolina
GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, New Mexico
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Virginia
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina

GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont
MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota
J. CALEB BOGGS, Delaware
JACK MILLER, Iowa
MARK O. HATFIELD, Oregon

COTYS M. MOUSER, *Chief Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND GENERAL LEGISLATION

B. EVERETT JORDAN, North Carolina, *Chairman*

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi
HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Virginia
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina

MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota
J. CALEB BOGGS, Delaware

CONTENTS

	Page
Statement of—	
Aiken, Hon. George D., a U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont	43
Byrd, Hon. Robert C., a U.S. Senator from the State of West Virginia	3
Conway, Jack T., executive director, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO	55
Davis, Howard P., Deputy Administrator, Consumer Food Programs, Consumer and Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture	29
Dechant, Tony T., president, National Farmers Union	35
Durrett, Milton R., manager, Alabama Food Council, Alabama Merchants Association, Birmingham, Ala	53
Freeman, Hon. Orville L., Secretary of Agriculture	14
Graham, Harry L., legislative representative, National Grange	30
Hamer, Mrs. Fannie Lou, Commission on the Delta Ministry, National Council of the Churches of Christ, Ruleville, Miss	44
Horn, Mrs. Etta, vice chairman, National Coordinating Committee of Welfare Rights Groups	47
Johnson, Reuben L., director, legislative services, National Farmers Union	34
Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., a U.S. Senator from the State of New York	6
King, Ruben K., commissioner of the Department of Pensions and Security, State of Alabama, Montgomery, Ala	52
Lynn, John C., legislative director, American Farm Bureau Federation	55
McCall, Hon. Tom, Governor of the State of Oregon, Salem, Oreg	54
Mitchiner, Mrs. Myra J., American Public Welfare Association, Raleigh, N.C	37
Pinson, Clarence M., Western Grain Co., Birmingham, Ala	53
Sampson, Tim, staff associate, Poverty Rights Action Center	48
Sickels, Harvey, secretary, National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa	55
Sparkman, Hon. John, a U.S. Senator from the State of Alabama	52
Thompson, Winifred G., Director, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia	50
Wallace, Hon. Lurleen B., Governor of the State of Alabama, Montgomery, Ala	52
Miscellaneous documents—	
S. 953, 90th Congress	1
Letter from the Department of Agriculture requesting enactment of draft bill	2
Staff explanation of S. 953	2
Food stamp program statistics for selected months	14
Participation and coupon value by project area	15

FOOD STAMP APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION

TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1967

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
AND GENERAL LEGISLATION OF THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:15 a.m., in room 324, Old Senate Office Building, Senator B. Everett Jordan (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Jordan, Byrd of Virginia, Young of North Dakota, and Boggs.

Also present: Senator Aiken.

Senator JORDAN. The subcommittee will come to order.

I would like to read an opening statement on S. 953.

The subcommittee is holding hearings today on S. 953, which would extend the authority for the appropriation of funds to carry out the food stamp program indefinitely. At present the Food Stamp Act of 1964 authorizes appropriations to carry out the program only through June 30 of this year.

The House Committee on Agriculture has reported a similar bill, H.R. 1318, with amendments authorizing appropriations only for fiscal 1968; limiting such appropriation to not more than $195 million; and requiring States, beginning in fiscal 1970, to contribute 20 percent of that part of the coupon cost not borne by participating families.

There is inserted in the record at this point a copy of S. 953, a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture dated March 2, 1967, requesting enactment of this legislation, and a staff explanation of this bill.

Good morning, Senator Kennedy. We are glad to have you here. We just started off.

The bill will be inserted at this time, with a letter from the Secretary to Vice President Humphrey, and following that the staff explanation, and then the statement by Senator Robert Byrd, the author of this bill.

(The documents referred to follow:)

[S. 953, 90th Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year" and substituting therefor "and for each subsequent fiscal year such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, P.L. 88–525.

This bill would amend Section 16 of the Food Stamp Act. It would provide appropriation authority for fiscal years beyond 1967. No other change in the substantive legislative authorities for the Food Stamp Program is deemed necessary at this time.

P.L. 88–525, approved by the President on August 31, 1964, contemplated the progressive expansion of the program—over the period of the next several years—to those States and political subdivisions that desired to participate. That Act, however, provided appropriation authorities only through the fiscal year 1967. It is necessary, therefore, that Section 16 of the Act be amended to provide appropriation authorities to implement that policy of orderly and progressive program expansion.

When the Food Stamp Act was approved, the program was then operating in 43 areas—in 22 States—in which the food stamp approach had been carefully tested during a 3-year "pilot" period. Since then, the pace of the authorized expansion has, in fact, not kept pace with requests from States for the program. Nonetheless, by the end of the 1967 fiscal year, the program will be operating in about 800 areas in 41 States and the District of Columbia.

In requesting appropriation authority beyond 1967, it is contemplated that the policy of orderly and progressive year-to-year expansion would be continued. Such a policy would continue to permit State welfare agencies and this Department to provide the administrative organization and program supervision that is needed to insure the effective and efficient use of Federal funds in support of program objectives.

Action to assure States that the program will be continued beyond June 30, 1967, should be taken at the earliest possible date. If the future of the program for the next fiscal year remains in doubt, States will hesitate to complete 1967 fiscal year expansion plans—much less undertake the longer range plans to build the administrative organization needed to adequately supervise already operating programs.

The actual level of the annual appropriation for each fiscal year beyond 1967 would be determined by the Congress under the annual appropriation process. Additionally, because the proposed bill is concerned only with the continuation of appropriation authorities, it would not affect program cost or employment requirements for the program.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Staff Explanation of S. 953

(SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4)

Short explanation

Extends Food Stamp Program. Section 16(a) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 now authorizes appropriations to carry out the program only through June 30, 1967. The bill would authorize appropriations of such amounts as may be needed for all subsequent years.

Facts about the program

The program is designed to provide needy households with a means of obtaining a nutritionally adequate diet. Pursuant to approved State plans, participating households exchange the amount of money they normally expend for food for food coupons of higher monetary value. The coupons are used to purchase food in approved retail stores, which then exchange the coupons for funds appropriated to carry out the program. Certification of eligible households and issuance of coupons is the responsibility of the State agency administering federally aided public assistance programs. The poorest families pay about $2.00 per person for about $10 worth of coupons per person. The average family in the program pays about 64 percent of the value of the coupons it receives.

History

A food stamp plan was operated by the Department of Agriculture between 1939 and 1943 under the authority of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress. In September 1959, a food stamp program was explicitly authorized by P.L. 86–341 for the period ending January 31, 1962. This authority was not exercised, but in 1961 a pilot food stamp program was undertaken pursuant to section 32 of Public Law 320.

When the Food Stamp Act of 1964 was passed in August 1964, about 351,000 persons were participating in 43 pilot areas in 22 States. In January 1967, about 1.4 million persons were participating in 589 areas in 41 States and the District of Columbia.

The 1964 Act authorized appropriations not exceeding $75 million for fiscal 1965, $100 million for fiscal 1966, and $200 million for fiscal 1967. S. 953 authorizes appropriation of such sums as may be necessary in the future.

House committee action

On March 20, the House Committee on Agriculture ordered H.R. 1318 (companion to S. 953) reported with amendments authorizing appropriations only for fiscal 1968, limiting such appropriation to not more than $195 million, and requiring States beginning in fiscal 1970, to contribute 20 percent of that part of the coupon cost not borne by participating families.

Departmental views

The Department of Agriculture requested enactment.

Objections in file

None. The National Cotton Council and the National Catholic Rural Life Conference have asked to be notified if hearings are held.

Statement of Hon. Robert C. Byrd, a U.S. Senator From the State of West Virginia

I am the sponsor of S. 953, providing for the indefinite continuation of the Federal Food Stamp Program, so that this vital assistance to needy families may be provided on a stabilized basis. Otherwise, many deserving persons may not be able to purchase all the food they so greatly need.

For those of us who have watched the operations of this program since its inception, it is not comprehensible that a weapon of this tremendous value in the battle for improved standards of living can be permitted to lapse, or that the constant threat of lapsing will be permitted to impair its usefulness.

The people who have received the food stamps have benefited from it directly by receiving the "bonus" buying power, which they provide, and the communities in which they have been used have been economically benefited. I have had a steady flow of letters telling me of the visual evidence of the good which has been gained from the additional food for needy families in West Virginia, who have been eligible for participation in the food stamp program. School officials and teachers have pressed for its continuance in West Virginia and its expansion within the State to cover all of its counties, because of their personal observations that the children receiving extra food at home, through the program, are visually more alert and capable of progressively advancing the level of their school work.

West Virginia inaugurated this program as a pilot study in December 1961 and since its beginning in one West Virginia county it has spread to 589 counties in 41 States. I am told that it is estimated that approximately 1.4 million people share in the benefits of the food stamps in these 41 States and the District of Columbia.

In West Virginia, the program is operating in 40 counties, with an additional 8 expected to begin food stamp operations in early May. The total appropriation for the operation of the program for FY 1967 was $140,000,000. If the present appropriations request for operation of the program during 1968 is approved—$195,000,000—it will allow a reasonable smount of expansion during 1968, and it is hoped that the remaining seven of West Virginia's 55 counties can be blanketed in.

The following table will provide statistics on the operation of the Food Stamp Program in West Virginia:

West Virginia food stamp program

SELECTED STATISTICS

A. Program expansion

The following table shows the expansion of the program since June 1965:

	Participants
June 1965 (4 counties)	29, 060
June 1966 (19 counties)	72, 086
February 1967 (40 counties)	93, 640

Eight additional counties are scheduled to enter the program in May 1967.

The State welfare agency has requested the program for the remaining seven counties in the State.

B. Coupon issuance

The following table shows for each fiscal year since the beginning of the pilot program in West Virginia, the total value of coupons issued, the amount of federally financed bonus coupons issued and the total cash payments by participants:

Fiscal year	Total coupons issued	Bonus coupons	Cash paid by participants
1962 [1]	$2, 817, 352	$1, 335, 079	$1, 482, 273
1963	4, 773, 248	2, 011, 542	2, 761, 706
1964	5, 992, 093	2, 396, 728	3, 595, 365
1965	5, 766, 852	2, 258, 477	3, 508, 375
1966	10, 672, 277	4, 348, 925	6, 323, 352
July 1966 through February 1967	10, 877, 629	4, 432, 732	6, 444, 897
Total	40, 899, 451	16, 783, 483	24, 115, 968

[1] Includes June 1961 issuance.

C. Impact of the amendment requiring States to pay 20% of the cost of bonus coupons commencing in fiscal year 1970

Under a fully expanded Statewide program, it is possible, that for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969 the issuance of bonus coupons in West Virginia could amount to $12,000,000. In this event, the proposed amendment to the Food Stamp Act would require the State to pay 20% of the cost of these bonus coupons—$2,500,000—in addition to the intra-State costs of the program.

On the National level, I am advised that the cost of the Food Stamp Program from December 1, 1961, through December 31, 1966, amounted to $202,808,734. Added to this amount, families receiving the stamps spent another $342,574,529, for a total food expenditure of $545,383,263.

I note that comments have been made in the House of Representatives, in considering similar legislation to my bill, that the value of the Food Stamp Program does not match that of the Federal school lunch and commodity distribution programs. To that, I can answer that the nutritional problems of the State of West Virginia and similar regions throughout the United States persist despite the hard work of State and Federal officials in the administration and distribution of foodstuffs under these two other programs.

The commodity distribution program is heavily restricted in the variety of food distributed, so that there is always a built-in danger of poor nutrition from lack of certain essential nutrients. The school lunch program does indeed benefit the children in attendance at schools, but what about the other members of families—the elderly at home—the expectant mothers—to mention two classifications of family members certainly in need of balanced nutritional values. What about the needs of the pre-school children?

There is an additional benefit to be derived from the administration of the Food Stamp Program—it has an accelerating effect on businesses in the communities participating in it, generating new economic activity in an estimated ratio of $7 for each $1 in new money spent for food.

I would be pleased to answer questions as to the operations of the Food Stamp Program in West Virginia—operations which, from personal observation, convince me of the great merit of continuation of the program without crippling amendment or severely limiting the time factor.

Question:

I know West Virginia was the first State to start a pilot food stamp program back in 1961. And, as I recall, at that time the State was distributing the surplus foods in all countries. Since you have personally taken an interest in these programs, could you tell us why your State prefers the food stamp approach?

Answer:

1. West Virginia definitely prefers the food stamp approach. After seeing the actual results of the pilot test in four West Virginia counties—the State moved quickly to include other counties.

2. In fact, all but 7 of the 55 counties in the State will have food stamp programs by May of this year. And, our State Welfare Commissioner Lon Vincent has told me he wants to bring in the 7 other counties as soon as possible. I am very hopeful that those 7 counties can be brought in early in the next fiscal year.

3. I have followed these programs very closely, and I feel these are the reasons why West Virginia prefers the food stamp approach.

(*a*) It does provide low-income families with a more dignified way to obtain the extra food they want. And, it provides them with a greater variety of food and a better chance for a nutritious diet. And, of course, they are making a financial investment in the program.

(*b*) In addition to helping people, it gives an economic boost to the local economy. The additional dollars moving into the community in the form of extra coupons means more retail sales. The retailer buys more food from the wholesaler, and some have told me that they have had to put on more help.

This, of course, was not true of the surplus foods. But, that program was of tremendous help, before food stamp started.

(*c*) I also believe the Food Stamp Program is subject to better management and control. The State welfare agency can plan it better and provide the kind of staff to see that it is well supervised.

Frankly, it's very well accepted and supported throughout the State.

Question:

It has been said that States would not be able to operate the program if they had to finance part of the cost of the bonus coupons. Do you think that would be true in West Virginia?

Answer:

1. Very definitely. The State just would not be in a position to do that.

2. And, of course, the counties could not pick up the cost.

3. I believe the State would have to return to the surplus commodity program because it is not required to finance any part of the cost of the surplus foods themselves.

4. I do want to point out that West Virginia is now financing the cost of administering the Food Stamp Program within the State. The 1964 Act requires the State to use trained merit-system personnel in certifying families. The State also pays the cost of issuing the coupons.

It may well be that it is costing West Virginia somewhat more to run the Food Stamp Program than it did the surplus food program. But, they obviously believe the stamp program is worth it.

5. West Virginia is now under real pressure to raise the tax funds they need for their basic welfare programs.

Food stamps are a very valuable supplement to those welfare programs. But the State would just not be able to pay for part of free coupons.

6. If, in fact, West Virginia could afford the kind of welfare program that is needed, the State would not necessarily need to have food stamps in addition.

Question:

I've heard considerable talk that eligible people should receive the food stamps free of charge. Do you think they should?

Answer:

1. First, the idea that people should help themselves—in accordance with their ability—has always seemed to me to be a sound approach.

2. The families invest in the program, the amounts they have been spending for food. So, in this sense, the purchase requirement is not a cost. It's an exchange of the money *they would have had to spend for food,* for the food coupons that are worth more.

78-504—67——2

3. I am not in a position to say whether these purchase requirements—the exact amount families pay—need to be modified. But, I certainly concur in the principle behind the purchase requirement. This is what guarantees that the Federal subsidy will be used for more and better food.

4. If there is some question about the exact amount the families pay, I am sure this can be worked out with the people in the Department of Agriculture.

Question:

What do you think about running both the Food Stamp Program and the Commodity Distribution Program in the same county? Do you know if West Virginia would want that authority?

Answer:

1. Well, the State people have never talked to me about it.

2. I would want to point out that surplus foods can be made available if a disaster disrupts the normal commercial marketing of food.

3. We recently had some floods in West Virginia and the surplus foods were used to help out families during that emergency.

4. Frankly I don't believe the operation of two different programs to give food assistance to needy families would be very practical.

I do not believe West Virginia could afford to pay the increased administrative costs involved—they would have to store and distribute the surplus food and they would have to also pay the cost of issuing the stamps.

5. It seems to me that the stamp program is a flexible program that can be adjusted to meet the needs.

6. And, of course, any State or county can continue in the commodity program—they do not have to go into food stamps.

Question:

From the State's point of view, do you feel appropriations for the program should be authorized for more than a year at a time?

Answer:

1. Yes—as far as the authority is concerned. Of course, the Congress must look at the *amount* to be appropriated on a year-to-year basis.

2. The State does need some assurance that the program will continue and will be expanded in line with State and local requests.

3. In this way, they can plan in advance for the funds and the staff they need to operate and supervise the program.

4. The program has been carefully planned and supervised and I believe that a year-to-year extension would make it difficult for the States to continue the good job they have been doing.

Question:

It's been said that the program isn't flexible enough—that some poor families can't participate. Would you care to comment on that?

Answer:

1. That is a very broad question and I can only comment with respect to my own knowledge of the West Virginia experience.

2. I know our State welfare agency did have some problems, for example, in staffing up to meet certification standards for local personnel. But, these problems were worked out between the State people and the Department of Agriculture.

3. I believe I would reflect the feeling of our State Commissioner in saying that I have found the Agriculture people to be reasonable, practical people. If some modifications are needed, I believe these could be worked out.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Kennedy, we are glad to have you with us this morning, and we will be glad to hear from you at this time.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do you want me to read this statement or put it in the record?

Senator JORDAN. You can put it in the record in its entirety, or do as you please, sir.

Senator KENNEDY. Perhaps I will read a little bit of it.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to express my support for S. 953 to continue and expand the food stamp program.

The program has received support from 41 States and the District of Columbia, and more communities and States want to initiate the program.

In my State, one project has been operating in Erie County since February 1966. Participation in this program averaged about 20,000 persons a month during the first year. These people received over $1 million in additional food purchasing power.

An additional 14 areas—13 counties and one city—were designated for the program last November. Two of those 14 started the program on April 1 and the others are expected to begin shortly. The State welfare agency has indicated to the Department that it eventually plans to operate the program statewise if all counties are interested in participating.

Last October New York State requested the program also for New York City, hoping to begin in fiscal 1968. As many as 200,000 persons of low income in New York City may be eligible for the food stamps if this application is approved. This would bring some $10 to $15 million in added purchasing power to the city.

Of the 15 largest cities in the country, only two—New York and Boston—are not included in the program. The need for the program is evident when you realize that 70 percent of the people on welfare in the State of New York live in New York City.

To put this food stamp program in really means an improved diet for people there who are presently living on inadequate diets.

I should like to mention at this point my concern, which I think is shared by many, with the action taken by the House committee in adding an amendment to increase the State participation in the cost of the program to 20 percent of the cost of bonus coupons. The Department estimates that States now provide about 7 percent of administrative costs through their work in certifying families and distributing coupons. At the project level of the program next year, the 20-percent requirement would mean $40 million a year which the States would have to pay. It is estimated that New York would face $4.4 million in additional costs. Coupled with the administrative costs of running the program, the State would have to provide a total of $6 million. We are a wealthy State, Mr. Chairman, but, like every other State, have tax problems and financial problems. The State has just turned to a lottery because of those financial problems, and I know that other States also face the same kind of difficulties and will have a difficult time affording even this relatively small cost. So, I would hope that the committee would seriously consider the difficulty and problems that the House amendment might cause if it is added here in the Senate.

The House committee amendment would, in my opinion, cripple, and probably kill, the program. Costs to the States would rise to such a level that many States would have to drop out of the program. And it means that those who would obviously suffer from such an action are the recipients of the stamps: people on public assistance whose incomes do not permit them to spend enough for adequate amounts and kinds of food.

I was in Mississippi 2 weeks ago with the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty. I saw conditions of extreme hunger and saw people who eat only one meal a day or one meal each day for a period of a couple days. I saw widespread and extreme malnutrition and seriously inadequate diets. Farmworkers who in the past have had only a few months of work are now losing even that meager income as mechanization removes their jobs.

These problems are not all in Mississippi. Only 11 percent of the poor have access to a food distribution system in Alabama—the food stamp or the commodity distribution program. In South Carolina, the figure is 1.6 percent and in Virginia, 1.9 percent. But there are also many who are hungry in my State and throughout the country.

That is why I believe the food stamp program is so important, why it should be continued without the 20-percent State requirement imposed by the House committee and why consideration should be given soon to ways in which the program can be improved so that more of the poor, including those with no income at all, can maintain an adequate diet. The food stamp program increases the amount of food welfare families receive by about 50 percent.

This program is not a system of handouts. It requires the participating family to use some of its own income to purchase food and provides them with the opportunity to purchase more and better food for less money.

I cannot too strongly urge this committee to report out S. 953 in its present form. With this assurance that the program has a future, millions of low-income families in this country can continue to improve their diets and we can address outselves to needed improvements in our food distribution plans so that more may benefit.

I might just add on our trip to Mississippi, Mr. Chairman, we did see children with distended stomachs and with sores on their lips because of malnutrition, and who are really kept alive because of the food stamp program and the assistance that they receive. They have been driven off the farms now because of mechanization, and I think to some extent, also, the minimum wage, as Senator McClellan said in the Senate last week, and they do not have any place to go. The only thing that they and their children live on is the food they get from the Federal Government. I think if we would have difficulty in New York, certainly Mississippi would have great difficulty in paying the extra 20 percent which would be required by the House action, and I know that those people in the delta, particularly, desperately need the program.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Boggs, do you have any questions?

Senator BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to compliment Senator Kennedy for his appearance here and his presentation. We are glad to have your views and firsthand observations. Thank you very much.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Young.

Senator YOUNG. I thought it was a very fine statement, Senator.

I have been a cosponsor of this kind of legislation with Senator Aiken ever since I came to the Senate. I feel this is a fine program. The House requirement that the States provide 20 percent of the cost of the stamps may cause us some trouble. I know in the past I was always opposed to a requirement for local participation in the disaster

relief program but it was finally put into the legislation. However, it does appear there is some advantage if local interests have to put up a little money. There is a question whether it be 20 percent or 5 percent or 10 percent, but I think there is an advantage if local interests have to put up a little of the cost of these programs.

Secretary FREEMAN. Could I make a point here, that they do put up quite a little now because the cost of certification of the recipients is a very heavy burden and represents quite an investment of time and concern and participation. The normal good effect of requiring some local understanding and some local investment is more than met, I think, under this current requirement.

Senator YOUNG. This money is put by the individual counties?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, the State has to—you see, the State has to certify that the person is entitled to food stamps, which means they have got to interview them. It means that they have got to make a judgment as to their income, as to what they are spending for food, as to what they should be spending for food to have an optimum food income. And on that basis, why, then the food stamps are made available and a determination made as to how much they will be required to invest in order to get the number of stamps. So this does involve a rather considerable investment of personnel and money on the part of the States. This is not something that they just get without any effort on their own part.

Senator YOUNG. The State and the local political subdivisions do have to put up some money?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir, whether it is a local subdivision or the State, will depend on the local circumstances. But the financing of this whole machinery of certification is done by the county or the State in combination with the local people.

Senator BOGGS. The State or county has to run it.

Secretary FREEMAN. The State or county has to run the certification process.

Senator BOGGS. Will the Senator yield?

Senator YOUNG. Go ahead.

Senator BOGGS. From the State's standpoint, is it not cheaper to do this with the food stamp approach rather than distribute the surplus food?

Secretary FREEMAN. I suspect this is a close question but—you just have to match off. In the direct food, the detailed certification does not take place. That cost would not be nearly as great. On the other hand, then you get into the very physical problem of warehousing, of handling, of distributing.

Senator BOGGS. And this covers much more.

Secretary FREEMAN. This covers much more, and it gives people access to different kinds of food.

In effect, what we are doing is using our commercial distribution system, rather than duplicate it with other nonconventional distribution systems.

Senator BOGGS. Thank you.

Senator YOUNG. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JORDAN. Mr. Secretary, I just noticed here on this list, right now New York State, the cost of their program is $1.5 million a

year. If you put up 20 percent of the bonus value, you would have $4.4 million additional to pay.

Senator Kennedy. Yes.

Senator Jordan. Which would make $5.9 million for New York State, and that same thing would be true all through the States, depending on the amount that they are now receiving.

Senator Young. Would you yield there?

Senator Jordan. Yes.

Senator Young. Would the House provision of 20 percent be in addition to what they are paying now?

Senator Jordan. It would be in addition to what is already there; that is correct. In other words, it would wind up at $5.9 million—this is in New York—instead of $1.5 million.

Senator Byrd, we are glad you got here.

Senator Byrd. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for being late.

Senator Jordan. That is all right, that is customary. You are a little ahead of time, according to the usual procedure around here. But we have heard the testimony of Senator Byrd—I mean Senator Kennedy.

Senator Kennedy. I do not mind getting mixed up.

Senator Jordan. This is Senator Byrd's bill of—West Virginia—we have here. Do you have any questions on this food stamp bill?

Senator Byrd. Not at the present time.

Senator Jordan. Thank you very much.

Are there any other questions?

Senator Kennedy. Could I just take 30 seconds more of your time?

Senator Jordan. Yes.

Senator Kennedy. I would hope that the committee, maybe not right at the moment, but that it would consider some of the problems that are created by those who have no income at all. Many of these people whom we saw during our poverty hearings have been thrown out of work and do not have access to any income, so that therefore they cannot buy the stamps. The result is that they are living virtually on nothing and the children are living virtually on nothing. And as I say, there is a tremendous amount of hunger, not just among older people but among hundreds and hundreds of children whom we saw. And as I say also, here in the United States in 1967 we saw a lot of children with swollen stomachs just as you see them in India or Africa.

Senator Jordan. That might be overeating. You cannot tell.

Senator Kennedy. No, no, it wasn't; because I asked them what they ate, but in any case it creates a problem for them. And for those who cannot afford to buy the stamps, it is a serious problem as to how they are going to get any food.

Senator Young. Mr. Chairman, off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator Kennedy. I just bring it to the committee's attention.

Senator Jordan. Well, thank you very much.

Senator Boggs. Let me ask the Senator right there, in those cases where they are not able to buy the stamps, what is being done for them?

Senator Kennedy. Nothing, really.

Senator Boggs. Are they not on county or State general welfare of some kind?

Senator KENNEDY. A lot of them cannot come under welfare, and many of them are trying at least to leave that area, and they will end up, of course—in the group that we saw, they end up in the ghettos of the North and then try to go on relief there.

Senator BOGGS. But there is nothing to reach them.

Senator KENNEDY. Not really. The fact is they do not have anything to eat, and they cannot get what some of the other families live on.

Senator BOGGS. Can the surplus food—there is not much surplus, but can that reach them, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary FREEMAN. We do not duplicate in a county both the food stamp and the direct distribution. The problem to which Senator Kennedy refers is the fact that in some States, in some areas, the relief is not available. Where relief is available the amount of money, or whatever it is that is made available for food is then used as the investment for these stamps. But if there is not any relief, we just face the cold hard fact that there is nothing by which to make the investment required by law to get the stamps.

Now, the current level within the Department that we have felt should be a minimum is $2 a month per person. And we have had under advisement for some time the question of what that amount should be in instances where there might not be any local relief program and thereby people literally having no source of income.

The other side of the coin in some instances is the basic philosophy and premise that the people in this program should put in what they have been spending for food so that they will not divert it to another use and end up in their diet no better than they were when they started.

That was a basic premise to this and the reason the food stamp broke down in the early period was because people would take the money they had been spending for food, put it for something else, and they ended up no better than when they started.

And as I say, that sum is under careful review now, and we felt that virtually everyone would be spending at least $2 a month for food, and therefore that was the basis on which that was set, but some of the subsequent developments and the results of some of our investigations, the results of the committee investigation which Senator Kennedy referred to in Mississippi, have resulted in some more review and investigation of this. We have it under review—under active consideration to this very moment possibly lowering that amount.

Senator BOGGS. I must say, Senator, it is a very, very pitiful sight.

Secretary FREEMAN. Because they are the ones we are trying to get at, too.

Senator KENNEDY. It is very disheartening when you see a child 7, 8, 9 years old, an American child, and you ask him what he had for breakfast—molasses, and you ask him what he had for lunch, and he did not have anything, and you ask his mother what she expects to feed him for dinner—and you find out it is going to be beans. That is what he is living on all the time, and they do not go to school. They cannot go to school, because, of course, they do not have any clothes.

Senator BOGGS. I do hope before this committee finishes that you have a recommendation along that line because it appears we are missing the very ones we must cover, somehow or other.

Senator KENNEDY. There is a great and most acute need.

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Secretary a question?

Senator JORDAN. Yes.

Senator YOUNG. You are buying beef now, are you not?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Senator YOUNG. For what purposes is this beef used?

Secretary FREEMAN. It goes in the school lunch program.

Senator YOUNG. None of this beef is being used for relief or the food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. No; well, it would not go to the food stamp program, you see, because the food stamp recipient would get this by buying it at the store. That is the function of the food stamp program. They buy it in the normal commercial outlets. But we have never, with a few exceptions, distributed on direct distribution perishables, because, generally speaking, there are not the physical conditions for adequate storage to get this kind of thing, such as fresh meats, to people who are the recipients of direct distribution of foods. They get canned meat. They will get canned meat but not fresh meat.

Senator YOUNG. When cattle prices were down, I believe it was in 1955, the Department of Agriculture purchased around 860,000 head of cattle.

Secretary FREEMAN. About $240 million worth of beef we bought in 1964.

Senator YOUNG. In some cases this was distributed for relief around the world.

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, no; it was distributed in the United States, but it was canned meat, primarily, and we are still doing that.

Senator YOUNG. There was some given to foreign countries, too, for relief.

Secretary FREEMAN. I would have to check.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Secretary, there was a program to assist the Greek Army, but this was not a grant, I do not believe.

Secretary FREEMAN. Anyway, if it was—you may be right—it was a very small volume, but we are now, the question is we are now purchasing at about $1 million level, and that would go in terms of fresh meat into schools, and some of it that we would purchase as canned or mixed pork and beef does go out through direct distribution. And we can find some, I think, in Mississippi and other places.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Any further questions?

Thank you very much, Senator Kennedy. We appreciate your statement very much. It will be carried in its entirety in the record.

Senator Kennedy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The complete statement of Senator Kennedy follows:)

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to express my support for S. 953 to continue and expand the food stamp program.

As you know, Public Law 88–525, the Food Stamp Act of 1964 authorized appropriations for three years until June 30, 1967. To insure the continuity of the program, authorizing legislation must be enacted by the Congress before that date.

The program has received support from 41 states and the District of Columbia. Six hundred and fifty projects are in operation involving more than two million low-income families. And many more communities and states wish to initiate the program.

In my state, one project has been operating in Erie County since February, 1966. Participation in this program averaged about 20,000 persons a month during the first year. These people received over $1 million in additional food purchasing power.

An additional fourteen areas—thirteen counties and once city—were designated for the program last November. Two of those 14 started the program on April 1 and the others are expected to begin shortly. The State Welfare agency has indicated to the Department that it eventually plans to operate the program statewide if all counties are interested in participating

Last October, New York State requested the program also for New York City, hoping to begin in fiscal 1968. This application is now being reviewed at the Department with all indications that it will be approved if the money is available to the Department. As many as 200,000 persons of low income in New York can expect to be eligible for the food stamps. If the food stamp bonus averaged about $66 a year for each of these applicants, an additional $10 to $15 million in purchasing power could be expected in the city.

Of the 15 largest cities in the country, only two—New York and Boston—are not included in the program. The need for the program is evident when you realize that 70 percent of the people on welfare in the State of New York live in New York City.

What is so very important for these people in New York City and those in the other 15 areas in the state is the opportunity for an improved diet, the means to obtain more and better food.

I should like to mention at this point my concern with the action taken by the House Committee in adding an amendment to increase the state participation in the cost of the program to 20 percent of the cost of bonus coupons. The Department estimates that states now provide about 7 percent of administrative costs through their work in certifying families and distributing coupons. At the projected level of the program next year, the 20 percent requirement would mean $40 million a year which the states would have to pay. It is estimated that New York State would face $4.4 million in additional costs. Coupled with administrative costs of running the program, the State would have to provide about a total of $6 million.

The House committee amendment would, in my opinion, cripple and probably kill the program. Costs to the states would rise to such a level that many states would drop out of the program. Those who would obviously suffer from such an action are the recipients of the stamps—people on public assistance whose incomes do not permit them to spend enough for adequate amounts and kinds of food.

When I was in Mississippi two weeks ago with the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, I saw conditions of extreme hunger. I saw people who eat only one meal a day or one meal every two days. I saw widespread and extreme malnutrition and seriously inadequate diets. Farm workers who in the past have had only a few months of work are now losing even that meager income as mechanization removes their jobs.

These problems are not all in Mississippi. Only 11 percent of the poor have access to a food distribution system in Alabama—the food stamp or the commodity distribution program. In South Carolina, the figure is 1.6 percent and in Virginia, 1.9 percent. But there are also many who are hungry in my state and throughout the country.

This is why the food stamp program is so important, why it should be continued without the 20 percent state requirement imposed by the House committee and why consideration should be given soon to ways in which the program can be improved so that more of the poor, including those with no income at all, can maintain an adequate diet. The food stamp programs increases the amount of food welfare families receive by about 50 percent.

This program is not a system of handouts. It requires the participating family to use some of its own income to purchase food and provides them with the opportunity to purchase more and better food for less money.

I cannot too strongly urge this Committee to report out S. 953 in its present form. With this assurance that the program has a future, millions of low-income families in this country can continue to improve their diets and we can address ourselves to needed improvements in all our food distribution plans so that more may benefit.

78-504—67——3

Senator JORDAN. Mr. Secretary, we would be glad to hear from you at this time, and your statement will go in the record in its entirety. You may handle it any way you see fit.

STATEMENT OF HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Secretary FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will quickly review my statement. It is not very long, and I will, of course, welcome your questions.

I am happy to appear here this morning to discuss the food stamp program with you.

The food stamp program is a success.

It has more than lived up to our very high expectations of 3 years ago.

It has, in fact, been an exciting, imaginative, and effective venture.

It has charted a new course in the wise and prudent use of this country's abundance of food.

It has improved the diets and health of our low-income families.

It has expanded food markets for our farmers.

It has stimulated the local economies of the areas in which it operates.

And again I want to pay tribute to the vision of members of this committee, who, in 1964, helped enact the Food Stamp Act. And I want—as I did then—to acknowledge the special contribution of Senator Aiken of the committee—who, for more than 20 years worked to enact such legislation.

Mr. Chairman, there is attached to my statement a table which shows the progress we have made since the act was signed in August 1964. I am also submitting for the record detailed data for each of the 645 areas that operated food stamp programs in February of this year, in which 1.5 million people in 41 States and the District of Columbia were participating.

(The table referred to follows:)

Food stamp program—Selected program statistics for specified months

Item	For the month of—				
	August 1964	June 1965	June 1966	February 1967	June 1967 (projection)
Number of States	22	29	[1] 41	[1] 42	[1] 43
Number of areas	43	110	324	645	875
Number of participants	350,550	632,687	1,218,399	1,557,063	2,000,000
Number of retail foodstores	13,300	18,000	42,200	60,900	88,000
Number of wholesale foodstores	700	1,000	1,500	1,600	2,000
Monthly value of coupons issued:					
Total coupons	$5,865,057	$10,639,497	$20,577,786	$26,409,959	$34,000,000
Bonus coupons	$2,235,405	$3,988,717	$7,398,372	$9,559,675	$12,280,000
Percent of bonus coupons	38%	37%	36%	36%	36%
Bonus coupons per person	$6.38	$6.30	$6.07	$6.14	$6.14

[1] Includes the District of Columbia.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Alabama (3):							
Greene	82	3,410	3,492	$42,160	$6,696	63	$7.64
Jefferson	3,209	6,661	9,870	131,710	69,615	53	7.05
Walker	2,087	2,564	4,651	67,882	33,618	50	7.23
Total	5,378	12,635	18,013	241,752	129,919	54	7.21
Alaska (1):							
Nome	9	88	97	2,040	724	35	7.46
Arkansas (21):							
Arkansas	246	505	751	11,026	4,771	43	6.35
Bradley	215	364	579	8,876	3,415	38	5.90
Conway	718	407	1,125	17,846	6,668	37	5.93
Craighead	387	924	1,311	19,454	9,439	49	7.20
Crittenden	546	7,256	7,802	89,683	54,836	61	7.03
Cross (New)	186	1,617	1,803	21,088	11,791	56	6.54
Faulkner	321	126	447	8,552	2,574	30	5.76
Independence	692	632	1,324	21,382	9,075	42	6.85
Izard	165	158	323	5,642	2,140	38	6.63
Jefferson	764	4,081	4,845	59,677	33,231	56	6.86
Lee	675	3,655	4,330	50,451	28,979	57	6.69
Lincoln	560	635	1,195	16,902	8,470	50	7.09
Lonoke	540	1,513	2,053	26,229	13,894	53	6.76
Mississippi	1,755	6,161	7,916	103,769	55,599	54	7.02
Monroe	495	2,175	2,670	33,362	19,312	58	7.23
Perry	382	93	475	8,594	2,682	31	5.64
Phillips	1,768	6,642	8,410	105,842	58,773	56	6.99
Poinsett (New)	755	1,864	2,619	37,073	17,921	48	6.84
Prairie	374	186	560	9,210	3,322	36	5.95
Pulaski	2,256	1,437	3,693	55,497	21,714	39	5.88
St. Francis	1,179	4,454	5,633	67,156	40,564	60	7.20
Total	14,979	44,885	59,864	777,311	409,170	53	6.83
California (4):							
Contra Costa	7,853	1,746	9,599	184,061	49,461	27	5.15
Humboldt	1,575	661	2,236	46,111	13,153	29	5.88
Los Angeles	66,201	14,526	80,727	1,492,529	406,254	27	5.03
San Francisco	8,515	2,279	10,794	219,997	58,603	27	5.43
Total	84,144	19,212	103,356	1,942,698	527,471	27	5.10
Colorado (26):							
Adams	[1] 1,050	[1] 669	[1] 1,719	31,725	10,211	32	[1] 5.94
Alamosa	[1] 143	[1] 223	[1] 366	5,686	2,300	40	[1] 6.28
Arapahoe	[1] 900	[1] 221	[1] 1,121	22,500	6,682	30	[1] 5.96
Bent (New)	[1] 148	[1] 200	[1] 348	6,666	2,190	33	[1] 6.29
Boulder	[1] 275	[1] 191	[1] 466	9,116	2,784	31	[1] 5.97
Clear Creek	[1] 16	[1] 3	[1] 19	402	125	31	[1] 6.58
Conejos	[1] 175	[1] 585	[1] 760	11,266	4,943	44	[1] 6.50
Costilla	[1] 60	[1] 297	[1] 357	6,001	2,493	42	[1] 6.98
Crowley	[1] 60	[1] 64	[1] 124	2,397	838	35	[1] 6.76
Custer	[1] 27	[1] 4	[1] 31	671	210	31	[1] 6.76
Denver	[1] 9,200	[1] 2,170	[1] 11,370	240,305	73,107	30	[1] 6.43
Elbert	[1] 18	[1] 1	[1] 19	478	126	26	[1] 6.63
Gilpin	[1] 17	[1] 12	[1] 29	[1] 645	200	31	[1] 6.90
Huerfano	[1] 326	[1] 280	[1] 606	11,298	3,642	68	[1] 6.01
Jefferson	[1] 654	[1] 373	[1] 1,027	20,108	6,108	30	[1] 5.95
Larimer	[1] 337	[1] 195	[1] 532	9,014	2,972	33	[1] 5.59
Las Animas	[1] 574	[1] 602	[1] 1,176	22,314	7,350	33	[1] 6.25
Logan (New)	[1] 100	[1] 81	[1] 181	3,409	1,137	33	[1] 6.28
Mesa	[1] 308	[1] 198	[1] 506	8,696	2,926	34	[1] 5.78
Otero	[1] 379	[1] 377	[1] 756	11,823	4,508	38	[1] 5.96
Phillips (New)	[1] 16	[1] 10	[1] 26	544	164	30	[1] 6.31
Prowers (New)	[1] 100	[1] 86	[1] 186	3,415	1,168	34	[1] 6.28
Pueblo	[1] 2,318	[1] 1,459	[1] 3,777	69,664	23,075	33	[1] 6.11
Rio Grande-Mineral	[1] 197	[1] 321	[1] 518	8,262	3,372	41	[1] 6.51
Washington (New)	[1] 60	[1] 24	[1] 84	1,734	528	30	[1] 6.29
Weld	[1] 850	[1] 332	[1] 1,182	21,206	7,376	35	[1] 6.24
Total	[1] 18,308	[1] 8,978	[1] 27,286	529,345	170,535	32	[1] 6.25

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Connecticut (1):							
Waterbury District	2,093	1,517	3,610	$67,837	$19,022	28	$5.27
District of Columbia (1):							
Washington	11,637	7,269	18,906	319,106	116,027	36	6.14
Georgia (18):							
Bibb	1,249	1,951	3,200	48,820	20,135	41	6.29
Burke	204	1,014	1,218	14,970	6,924	46	5.68
Charlton	176	270	446	6,035	2,755	46	6.18
Clinch	109	115	224	3,454	1,406	41	6.28
Echols	75	98	173	2,674	972	36	5.62
Hall	254	361	615	10,271	3,851	37	6.26
Hancock	101	581	682	8,747	4,185	48	6.14
Houston	117	447	564	8,014	3,634	45	6.44
Lowndes	430	407	837	12,225	4,886	40	5.84
Lumpkin	210	94	304	4,908	1,870	38	6.15
Mitchell	338	802	1,140	15,986	6,996	44	6.14
Pulaski	151	348	499	6,949	2,768	40	5.55
Rabun	215	351	566	9,185	3,763	41	6.65
Richmond	565	643	1,208	17,160	6,045	35	5.00
Stephens	137	212	349	5,761	2,315	40	6.63
Taliaferro	49	85	134	1,789	796	44	5.94
Thomas	530	637	1,167	16,880	7,357	44	6.30
Washington	79	651	730	8,995	4,587	51	6.28
Total	4,989	9,067	14,056	202,823	85,245	42	6.06
Hawaii (3):							
Honolulu	4,157	792	4,949	100,610	[1] 28,076	28	5.67
Kauai	238	125	363	7,350	[1] 2,059	28	5.67
Maui	447	193	640	12,450	[1] 3,631	29	5.67
Total	4,842	1,110	5,952	120,410	33,766	28	5.67
Illinois (53):							
Alexander	872	435	1,307	24,253	6,854	28	5.24
Bond	107	46	153	2,912	818	28	5.35
Calhoun	91	45	136	2,810	792	28	5.82
Champaign (New)	577	26	603	10,022	2,651	26	4.40
Clark (New)	81	29	110	2,288	622	27	5.65
Clay	166	134	300	5,194	1,530	29	5.10
Clinton	32	50	82	1,529	488	32	5.95
Coles (New)	144	21	165	3,358	883	26	5.35
Cook	77,503	6,703	84,206	1,630,170	440,373	27	5.23
Crawford	134	68	202	3,878	1,110	29	5.50
Cumberland (New)	10	48	58	1,128	387	34	6.67
De Witt (New)	35	42	77	1,461	422	29	5.48
Douglas (New)	65	75	140	2,596	771	30	5.51
Edgar (New)	123	38	161	2,888	796	28	4.94
Edwards	8	55	63	1,228	400	33	6.35
Effingham (New)	176	53	229	3,905	1,096	28	4.79
Fayette	124	55	179	3,658	1,016	28	5.68
Franklin	1,457	640	2,097	45,509	12,319	27	5.87
Gallatin	162	115	277	5,908	1,643	28	5.93
Greene	164	90	254	4,351	1,230	28	4.84
Hamilton	112	77	189	3,929	1,204	31	6.37
Hardin	181	68	249	5,604	1,480	26	5.94
Iroquois (New)	50	0	50	1,007	261	26	5.22
Jackson	612	258	870	16,187	4,603	28	5.29
Jasper	56	81	137	2,535	770	30	5.62
Jefferson	851	308	1,159	23,285	6,379	27	5.50
Jersey	69	66	135	2,663	740	28	5.48
Johnson	82	98	180	3,552	1,055	30	5.86
Lawrence	359	147	506	9,368	2,567	27	5.07
Macon (New)	1,258	54	1,312	22,482	5,875	26	4.48
Macoupin	166	153	319	6,579	1,886	29	5.91
Madison	2,251	900	3,151	37,706	10,551	28	3.35
Marion	531	388	919	16,785	5,011	30	5.45
Massac	353	115	468	9,325	2,561	27	5.47
Monroe	85	36	121	1,762	539	31	4.45
Montgomery	141	72	213	3,861	1,094	28	5.14
Moultrie (New)	79	13	92	1,609	463	29	5.03
Perry	144	74	218	4,564	1,242	27	5.70

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Illinois—Continued							
Piatt (New)	70	7	77	$1,293	$332	26	$4.31
Pope	178	70	248	4,713	1,298	28	5.23
Pulaski	868	271	1,139	20,804	5,792	28	5.09
Randolph	80	104	184	3,515	1,066	30	5.79
Richland	51	32	83	1,703	505	30	6.08
St. Clair	9,033	1,086	10,119	216,776	58,374	27	5.77
Saline	711	394	1,105	24,175	6,657	28	6.02
Shelby (New)	50	36	86	1,265	360	28	4.19
Union	181	138	319	6,463	1,897	29	5.95
Vermilion (New)	282	2	284	3,767	1,032	27	3.63
Wabash	67	35	102	2,264	618	27	6.06
Washington	26	0	26	581	146	25	5.62
Wayne	127	40	167	2,688	723	27	4.33
White	118	121	239	4,921	1,412	29	5.91
Williamson	666	305	971	22,180	6,052	27	6.23
Total	101,919	14,317	116,236	2,248,957	610,746	27	5.25
Indiana (17):							
Bartholomew	247	167	414	6,497	2,600	40	6.28
Floyd	428	439	867	13,383	5,160	39	5.95
Gibson	380	258	638	9,302	3,882	42	6.08
Harrison	150	284	434	7,588	2,823	37	6.50
Knox	341	327	668	12,523	4,345	35	6.50
Lake	7,134	1,415	8,549	140,244	47,574	34	5.56
Madison	954	165	1,119	10,875	4,116	38	3.68
Marion	4,327	2,046	6,373	101,677	35,975	35	5.64
Perry	385	301	686	[1] 12,860	[1] 4,246	[1] 33	[1] 6.19
Pike	283	139	422	6,100	2,602	43	6.17
Posey	184	384	568	8,087	3,329	41	5.86
Putnam	63	40	103	1,616	615	38	5.97
Spencer	310	237	547	8,873	3,385	38	6.19
Switzerland	53	89	142	2,300	912	40	6.42
Tipton	101	41	142	2,518	792	31	5.58
Vanderburgh	2,408	1,893	4,301	67,195	24,255	36	5.64
Warrick	256	262	518	8,467	3,142	37	6.07
Total	18,004	8,487	26,491	[1] 420,105	[1] 149,753	[1] 36	[1] 5.65
Iowa (42):							
Adams	28	23	51	1,067	315	30	6.18
Appanoose	324	165	489	10,688	3,027	28	6.19
Benton	96	47	143	3,011	775	26	5.42
Butler	74	82	156	2,858	806	28	5.17
Calhoun	64	74	138	2,634	756	29	5.48
Cerro Gordo	309	65	374	7,323	1,967	27	5.26
Clark	11	5	16	410	110	27	6.88
Dallas	165	67	232	4,871	1,394	29	6.01
Davis	39	30	69	1,390	428	31	6.20
Decatur	89	61	150	2,980	1,012	34	6.75
Des Moines	197	246	443	6,856	1,997	29	4.51
Dubuque	722	373	1,095	18,640	5,674	30	5.18
Franklin	46	46	92	1,796	515	29	5.60
Greene	88	70	158	2,954	792	27	5.01
Grundy	23	4	27	618	178	29	6.59
Guthrie	88	77	165	2,907	837	29	5.07
Hamilton	126	15	141	3,009	779	26	5.52
Hardin (New)	93	36	129	2,775	728	26	5.64
Harrison	56	64	120	2,444	743	30	6.19
Henry	54	13	67	1,504	424	28	6.33
Ida	18	32	50	1,024	288	28	5.76
Jasper	156	71	227	4,871	1,373	28	6.05
Johnson	303	123	426	4,417	1,288	29	3.02
Lee	305	196	501	10,147	2,731	27	5.45
Lucas	205	62	267	5,896	1,693	29	6.34
Madison	57	69	126	2,642	826	31	6.56
Marshall	98	27	125	2,728	777	28	6.12
Monona	109	135	244	4,540	1,443	32	5.91
O'Brien	120	45	165	3,499	966	28	5.85
Plymouth	62	24	86	1,968	490	25	5.70
Pottawattomie (New)	938	89	1,027	22,163	5,848	26	5.69

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Iowa—Continued							
Scott	797	483	1,280	$24,458	$7,033	29	$5.49
Sioux	121	33	154	3,398	918	27	5.96
Tama	63	62	125	2,391	666	28	5.33
Taylor	28	58	86	1,755	548	31	6.37
Union	128	79	207	4,308	1,151	27	5.56
Van Buren	89	36	125	2,786	750	27	6.00
Wapello	507	388	895	18,634	5,683	30	6.35
Warren	135	67	202	4,138	1,107	27	5.48
Washington	77	57	134	2,642	760	29	5.67
Wayne	114	38	152	3,286	922	28	6.07
Woodbury	2,041	536	2,577	50,965	14,208	28	5.51
Total	9,163	4,273	13,436	263,391	74,726	28	5.56
Kansas (5):							
Bourbon	169	44	213	4,442	1,288	29	6.05
Cherokee	614	71	685	14,245	4,020	28	5.87
Crawford	836	94	930	20,464	5,490	27	5.90
Labette	541	109	650	12,804	3,564	28	5.48
Wilson	154	12	166	2,907	882	30	5.31
Total	2,314	330	2,644	54,862	15,244	28	5.77
Kentucky (44):							
Adair	107	376	483	6,630	3,194	48	6.61
Bath	134	394	528	7,250	3,520	49	6.67
Bell	2,215	2,134	4,349	67,056	26,568	40	6.11
Breathitt	2,203	1,762	3,965	62,564	22,762	36	5.74
Campbell	233	400	633	9,352	4,123	44	6.51
Carter	225	883	1,108	15,566	7,880	51	7.11
Casey	185	650	835	11,312	6,046	53	7.24
Clark	90	128	218	3,391	1,401	41	6.43
Clay	1,270	2,749	4,019	57,898	25,846	45	6.43
Clinton	86	602	688	9,340	5,132	55	7.46
Cumberland	320	433	753	11,154	4,965	45	6.59
Elliott	241	308	549	8,074	3,332	41	6.07
Estill	346	622	968	14,580	6,458	44	6.67
Floyd	2,601	2,975	5,576	85,464	32,480	38	5.82
Harlan	2,452	3,435	5,887	87,570	35,712	41	6.07
Jackson	603	671	1,274	19,704	7,432	38	5.83
Jefferson	2,528	1,852	4,380	73,256	24,734	34	5.65
Johnson	772	1,849	2,621	37,852	18,216	48	6.95
Knott	2,881	2,509	5,390	82,464	30,264	37	5.61
Knox	1,887	2,527	4,414	66,640	26,908	40	6.10
Laurel	418	1,682	2,100	29,174	15,232	52	7.25
Lee	356	1,198	1,554	22,546	10,726	48	6.90
Leslie	1,700	1,702	3,402	51,406	20,628	40	6.06
Letcher	1,624	2,068	3,692	55,386	22,733	41	6.16
Lincoln	163	569	732	9,972	5,442	55	7.43
Logan	176	348	524	7,754	3,335	43	6.36
McCreary	603	1,442	2,045	28,776	13,574	47	6.64
Magoffin	1,122	1,941	3,063	44,322	19,616	44	6.40
Martin	1,439	1,140	2,579	39,072	14,936	38	5.79
Menifee	294	197	491	7,304	2,762	38	5.63
Montgomery	224	264	488	7,396	2,968	40	6.08
Morgan	665	776	1,441	21,236	8,808	41	6.11
Muhlenburg	177	374	551	8,668	3,894	45	7.07
Owsley	497	868	1,365	20,994	8,494	40	6.22
Perry	3,782	3,075	6,857	102,306	39,324	38	5.73
Pike	2,247	2,509	4,756	72,672	28,180	39	5.93
Pulaski	445	1,251	1,696	24,428	11,892	49	7.01
Rockcastle	246	923	1,169	16,350	8,592	53	7.35
Russell	81	637	718	9,370	5,606	60	7.81
Simpson	72	190	262	3,875	1,585	41	6.05
Todd	36	127	163	2,508	1,057	42	6.48
Wayne	206	1,357	1,563	20,344	11,986	59	7.67
Whitley	852	1,631	2,483	36,368	16,446	45	6.62
Wolfe	709	492	1,201	18,900	7,038	37	5.86
Total	39,513	54,020	93,533	1,398,244	581,827	42	6.22

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Louisiana (22):							
Acadia	1,500	2,600	4,100	$59,584	$27,718	47	$6.76
Assumption	302	1,512	1,814	21,482	11,299	53	6.23
Avoyelles	2,392	5,774	8,166	117,156	54,218	46	6.64
Calcasieu	1,559	1,403	2,962	43,155	18,100	42	6.11
Caldwell	218	444	662	9,530	4,200	44	6.34
East Baton Rouge	507	1,028	1,535	17,254	8,618	50	5.61
Evangeline	3,814	5,249	9,063	136,480	59,086	43	6.52
Franklin	745	3,525	4,270	53,558	28,191	53	6.60
Iberia	734	797	1,531	21,810	9,188	42	6.00
Iberville	470	1,798	2,268	27,030	12,900	46	5.69
Jefferson Davis	688	500	1,188	17,373	6,781	39	5.71
Lafayette	1,062	2,767	3,829	48,998	25,093	51	6.55
Natchitoches	1,167	2,672	3,829	51,138	26,279	51	6.84
Pointe Coupee	856	1,901	2,757	37,312	16,678	44	6.05
Red River	413	1,641	2,054	25,400	13,145	52	6.40
Richland	484	3,148	3,632	42,484	24,214	57	6.67
St. James	163	418	581	7,482	3,327	44	5.73
St. John	97	409	506	6,925	2,789	40	5.51
St. Landry	2,101	10,052	12,153	156,424	82,122	52	6.77
St. Martin	1,321	2,258	3,579	48,603	23,809	49	6.65
Vermilion	335	1,152	1,487	19,517	9,991	51	6.72
Winn	448	155	603	9,913	3,530	36	5.85
Total	21,376	51,203	72,579	978,608	471,276	48	6.49
Maine (1):							
Androscoggin	736	877	1,613	30,110	9,642	32	5.98
Maryland (10):							
Allegheny	937	417	1,354	27,517	8,999	33	6.65
Anne Arundel	711	703	1,414	24,152	9,070	38	6.41
Baltimore	696	135	831	16,456	6,012	37	7.23
Caroline	209	30	239	4,682	1,647	35	6.89
Charles	154	31	185	2,664	996	37	5.38
Dorchester	313	92	405	6,967	2,382	34	5.88
Garrett	356	330	686	13,530	4,734	35	6.90
Prince Georges (New)	223	26	249	4,154	1,621	39	6.51
Queen Annes	98	103	201	3,124	1,157	37	5.76
Talbot	121	65	186	3,096	1,124	36	6.04
Total	3,818	1,932	5,750	106,342	37,742	35	6.56
Michigan (6):							
Gogebic	686	371	1,057	20,896	5,729	27	5.42
Houghton	800	790	1,590	31,685	9,067	29	5.70
Macomb	2,316	563	2,879	59,674	17,007	28	5.91
Oakland	5,024	738	5,762	111,161	29,267	26	5.08
St. Clair	1,653	283	1,936	34,005	9,196	27	4.74
Wayne	41,036	7,490	48,526	929,742	246,766	27	5.09
Total	51,515	10,235	61,750	1,187,163	317,032	27	5.13
Minnesota (29):							
Aitkin	107	309	416	8,479	2,800	33	6.73
Anoka	492	310	802	15,391	4,164	27	5.19
Becker	259	741	1,000	17,366	5,897	34	5.90
Beltrami	530	893	1,423	25,192	8,041	32	5.65
Benton	62	280	342	5,466	1,737	32	5.08
Big Stone	147	145	292	5,690	1,734	30	5.94
Carlton	291	632	923	17,407	5,384	31	5.83
Chippewa	49	79	128	2,324	722	31	5.64
Crow Wing	185	723	908	17,570	5,482	31	6.04
Dakota	497	224	721	14,267	3,770	26	5.23
Hennepin	5,567	2,333	7,900	165,580	44,045	27	5.58
Hubbard	81	499	580	10,216	3,791	37	6.54
Itasca	274	674	948	17,898	5,621	31	5.93
Kandiyohi	337	326	663	12,810	3,895	30	5.87
Koochiching	260	310	570	11,235	3,086	27	5.41
Lac qui Parle	78	242	320	5,699	1,810	32	5.66
Lake	35	134	169	2,914	954	33	5.64
Otter Tail	146	143	289	5,792	1,674	29	5.79
Pine	186	245	431	8,892	2,522	28	5.85
Pipestone	45	96	141	2,741	832	30	5.90

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Minnesota—Continued							
Polk	249	351	600	$11,118	$3,464	31	$5.77
Ramsey	6,238	2,305	8,543	176,539	46,892	26	5.49
Renville	174	133	307	5,327	1,682	32	5.48
Roseau	97	112	209	3,492	1,194	34	5.71
Stearns	260	940	1,200	20,196	6,585	33	5.49
St. Louis	4,294	3,461	7,755	151,505	41,907	28	5.40
Swift	29	280	309	5,977	1,756	29	5.68
Washington	327	98	425	8,081	2,152	27	5.06
Wright	103	159	262	4,652	1,549	33	5.91
Total	21,399	17,177	38,576	759,816	215,142	28	5.58
Mississippi (20):							
Attala	612	2,132	2,744	36,450	19,674	54	7.17
Chickasaw	672	1,859	2,531	34,866	17,292	50	6.83
Clay	554	2,810	3,364	41,255	24,548	60	7.30
Coahoma	1,249	9,426	10,675	134,730	72,502	54	6.79
De Soto (New)	430	2,462	2,892	37,031	20,969	57	7.25
Forrest	787	2,086	2,873	38,420	20,129	52	7.01
Harrison	652	1,591	2,243	30,992	15,866	51	7.07
Jones	1,333	4,117	5,450	74,032	39,955	54	7.33
Leflore (New)	926	7,405	8,331	104,732	58,428	56	7.01
Lee	879	1,687	2,566	37,537	18,062	48	7.04
Lowndes	826	2,063	2,889	38,862	19,960	51	6.91
Madison	924	4,735	5,659	69,729	40,026	57	7.07
Marion	472	637	1,109	16,855	7,693	46	6.94
Panola	392	3,397	3,789	48,057	25,467	53	6.72
Pike	696	1,403	2,099	29,342	15,340	52	7.31
Quitman (New)	431	4,415	4,846	61,550	32,528	53	6.71
Tallahatchie (New)	1,138	4,987	6,125	78,958	42,955	54	7.01
Warren (New)	633	690	1,323	20,198	9,528	47	7.20
Yalobusha (New)	527	572	1,099	16,426	7,638	46	6.95
Yazoo	928	3,760	4,688	60,084	33,072	55	7.05
Total	15,061	62,234	77,295	1,010,106	541,632	54	7.01
Missouri (1):							
St. Louis (City)	14,175	8,888	23,063	371,649	156,659	42	6.79
Montana (3):							
Cascade	1,433	1,033	2,466	[1] 45,573	[1] 15,191	[1] 33	[1] 6.16
Deer Lodge	78	229	307	5,787	1,701	29	5.54
Silver Bow	952	337	1,289	26,470	7,731	29	6.00
Total	2,463	1,599	4,062	[1] 77,830	[1] 24,623	[1] 32	[1] 6.06
Nebraska (22):							
Boone	49	26	75	1,632	498	31	6.64
Boyd (New)	14	28	42	676	284	42	6.76
Buffalo	225	103	328	6,070	1,843	30	5.62
Clay	44	0	44	854	248	29	5.64
Cuming (New)	21	13	34	625	172	28	5.06
Custer	173	45	218	4,293	1,212	28	5.56
Dakota (New)	73	55	128	2,585	782	30	6.11
Douglas	4,765	2,189	6,954	134,350	46,906	35	6.75
Franklin	18	43	61	[1] 1,200	[1] 397	[1] 33	[1] 6.51
Gage	111	50	161	3,666	958	26	5.95
Hall	175	154	329	5,543	1,681	30	5.11
Holt	[1] 35	[1] 20	[1] 55	1,118	334	30	[1] 6.07
Keith	27	27	54	781	264	34	4.89
Lancaster	991	592	1,583	30,202	9,610	32	6.07
Morrill	51	36	87	1,815	549	30	6.31
Nemaha	66	56	122	2,475	719	29	5.89
Rock (New)	16	1	17	291	74	25	4.35
Sarpy	106	218	324	4,964	1,691	34	5.22
Saunders	98	161	259	4,358	1,603	37	6.19
Scotts Bluff-Banner	286	221	507	8,700	2,760	32	5.44
Sheridan	27	56	83	1,571	528	34	6.36
York	18	51	69	1,137	380	33	5.51
Total	[1] 7,389	[1] 4,145	[1] 11,534	[1] 218,906	[1] 73,493	[1] 34	[1] 6.37

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
New Jersey (4):							
Bergen (New)	975	151	1,126	$24,862	$6,001	24	$5.33
Camden (New)	3,026	1,005	4,031	86,760	23,478	27	5.82
Mercer	1,768	2,600	4,368	84,327	23,820	28	5.45
Salem	239	512	751	14,137	4,405	31	5.87
Total	6,008	4,268	10,276	210,086	57,704	27	5.62
New Mexico (17):							
Chaves	671	324	995	17,470	5,824	33	5.85
Colfax	277	185	462	7,898	2,953	37	6.39
Curry	662	400	1,062	18,153	6,808	38	6.41
Eddy	779	1,104	1,883	28,344	12,093	43	6.42
Guadalupe (New)	299	400	699	11,089	4,724	43	6.76
Harding	31	94	125	1,978	822	42	6.58
Lea	399	300	699	11,513	4,535	39	6.49
Mora	403	535	938	14,957	6,734	45	7.18
Quay	291	289	580	9,110	3,902	43	6.73
Rio Arriba	1,154	2,890	4,044	61,570	29,981	49	7.41
Roosevelt	283	673	956	13,952	6,470	46	6.77
Sandoval	350	1,633	1,983	27,631	16,213	59	8.18
San Miguel	1,754	2,138	3,892	63,596	26,879	42	6.90
Santa Fe	1,574	2,449	4,023	64,124	27,978	44	6.95
Taos	1,047	1,165	2,212	36,043	16,155	45	7.30
Torrence (New)	300	151	451	7,854	2,788	35	6.18
Union	110	35	145	2,786	944	34	6.51
Total	10,384	14,765	25,149	398,068	175,803	44	6.99
New York (1):							
Erie Welfare District	15,950	5,092	21,042	406,698	114,919	28	5.46
North Carolina (22):							
Bertie	573	4,032	4,604	59,736	32,360	54	7.03
Cabarrus	149	144	293	4,718	2,112	45	7.21
Chatham	159	428	587	8,744	4,252	49	7.24
Chowan	107	583	690	9,054	5,164	57	7.48
Cleveland	470	184	654	10,444	3,846	37	5.88
Dare	76	75	151	2,706	992	37	6.57
Durham	1,186	661	1,847	28,857	12,014	42	6.50
Forsyth	1,889	541	2,430	39,864	14,444	36	5.94
Franklin	474	1,560	2,034	26,544	13,678	52	6.72
Granville	110	805	915	11,322	6,200	55	6.78
Halifax	901	3,808	4,709	62,278	30,822	49	6.69
Harnett	281	320	601	11,115	4,771	43	7.94
Lee	522	368	890	13,275	5,440	41	6.11
Martin	441	2,534	2,975	38,558	20,396	53	6.86
Moore	538	302	840	13,034	5,290	41	6.30
Nash	1,631	5,974	7,605	99,618	52,816	53	6.94
New Hanover	607	270	877	15,119	5,603	37	6.39
Northampton	474	1,615	2,089	26,666	13,934	52	6.67
Orange	349	444	793	10,940	5,155	47	6.50
Person	367	593	960	12,894	6,222	48	6.48
Scotland	469	994	1,463	19,626	8,640	44	5.91
Surry	380	694	1,074	15,992	7,402	46	6.89
Total	12,153	26,929	39,082	541,104	261,553	48	6.69
North Dakota (1):							
Morton	164	280	444	7,750	2,731	35	6.15
Ohio (33):							
Allen	923	230	1,153	21,545	7,166	33	6.22
Ashland	127	42	169	3,212	1,026	32	6.07
Athens	967	332	1,299	24,614	8,659	35	6.67
Belmont (New)	908	208	1,116	22,602	7,692	34	6.89
Carroll (New)	99	61	160	2,949	1,043	35	6.52
Clark	866	571	1,437	27,330	8,904	33	6.20
Clermont	1,882	1,066	2,948	55,764	18,303	33	6.21
Columbiana	540	686	1,226	23,762	8,055	34	6.57
Coshocton (New)	97	16	113	2,313	711	31	6.29
Cuyahoga	58,621	4,647	63,268	1,188,182	414,238	35	6.55

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Ohio—Continued							
Franklin	15,263	1,700	16,963	$299,325	$106,309	36	$6.27
Guernsey (New)	507	187	694	13,492	4,658	35	6.71
Hamilton	21,115	6,345	27,460	511,847	171,417	33	6.24
Harrison	156	82	238	4,488	1,574	35	6.61
Holmes	97	17	114	2,434	772	32	6.77
Jefferson	1,226	489	1,715	34,468	12,060	35	7.03
Knox	107	75	182	3,834	1,188	31	6.53
Lake	363	67	430	8,802	2,684	30	6.24
Lawrence	2,211	1,166	3,377	64,246	23,838	37	7.06
Loraiu	2,186	814	3,000	56,969	20,163	35	6.72
Lucas	14,681	1,994	16,675	313,970	108,167	34	6.49
Mahoning	4,222	2,590	6,812	109,835	36,809	34	5.40
Monroe (New)	543	158	701	13,148	4,674	36	6.67
Morgan	146	154	300	5,159	1,739	34	5.80
Montgomery	7,304	1,238	8,542	159,280	56,872	36	6.66
Richland	1,238	679	1,917	26,198	9,626	37	5.02
Scioto	3,572	996	4,568	84,904	29,988	35	6.56
Stark	2,424	1,042	3,466	67,961	23,093	34	6.66
Summit	8,921	1,298	10,210	188,449	64,501	34	6.31
Trumbull	2,219	711	2,930	56,508	19,463	34	6.64
Tuscarawas	747	177	924	18,070	6,246	35	6.76
Washington	357	238	595	11,383	3,834	34	6.44
Wayne	252	69	321	6,775	2,196	32	6.84
Total	154,887	30,145	185,032	3,433,809	1,187,668	32	6.42
Oregon (1):							
Multnomah	9,100	2,288	11,388	203,994	58,358	29	5.12
Pennsylvania (29):							
Allegheny	42,940	8,328	51,268	967,379	296,725	31	5.79
Armstrong (New)	1,014	366	1,380	22,064	6,991	32	5.07
Blair (New)	1,976	795	2,771	47,500	14,650	31	5.29
Bradford	1,555	1,712	2,267	38,988	12,889	33	5.69
Cambria	4,404	1,440	5,844	118,008	37,387	32	6.40
Clarion (New)	676	248	924	18,562	5,708	31	6.18
Clearfield	2,187	979	3,166	55,368	17,964	32	5.67
Clinton	534	247	781	13,437	4,196	31	5.37
Crawford (New)	961	324	1,285	23,308	7,325	31	5.70
Dauphin	3,131	431	3,562	60,330	17,517	29	4.92
Fayette	12,192	2,064	14,256	263,161	81,649	31	5.73
Greene	1,870	708	2,578	41,771	13,813	33	5.36
Huntingdon	1,075	419	1,494	27,896	9,018	32	6.04
Indiana	1,814	659	2,473	34,531	11,555	33	4.67
Jefferson (New)	1,088	456	1,544	29,079	9,533	33	6.17
Lackawanna	4,469	2,392	6,861	126,815	40,970	32	5.97
Luzerne	6,039	3,066	9,105	167,127	54,637	33	6.00
McKean	1,025	430	1,455	25,742	8,079	31	5.55
Mifflin	696	197	893	14,545	4,629	32	5.18
Northumberland	1,379	746	2,125	37,659	11,776	31	5.54
Philadelphia	36,710	12,816	49,526	823,855	275,020	33	5.55
Potter	410	213	623	10,270	3,324	32	
Somerset	2,143	1,063	3,206	57,362	18,440	32	5.75
Sullivan	107	63	170	3,072	970	32	5.71
Susquehanna	571	303	874	12,406	4,028	32	4.61
Tioga	771	552	1,323	22,269	7,467	34	5.64
Verango (New)	1,061	411	1,472	25,460	7,717	30	5.24
Washington	4,447	1,596	6,043	106,167	34,605	33	5.73
Wyoming	202	105	307	6,136	1,935	32	6.30
Total	137,447	42,129	179,576	3,200,267	1,020,517	32	5.68
Rhode Island (4):							
Central Falls (City)	3,626	451	4,077	91,060	25,877	28	6.35
Pawtucket (City)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)		
Providence (City)	8,741	687	9,428	194,820	57,322	29	6.08
Woonsocket (City)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)		
Total	12,367	1,138	13,505	285,880	83,199	29	6.16

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
South Carolina (8):							
Beaufort (New)	322	116	438	$4,872	$2,736	56	$6.25
Cherokee	126	295	421	6,238	3,144	50	7.47
Dillon	229	4,816	5,045	60,296	37,540	62	7.44
Edgefield	96	577	673	9,172	4,792	52	7.12
Lee	201	3,504	3,705	43,284	27,791	64	7.50
McCormick	106	692	798	10,540	5,756	55	7.21
Williamsburg	456	6,446	6,902	86,310	50,530	59	7.32
York	204	930	1,134	15,466	8,364	54	7.38
Total	1,740	17,376	19,116	236,178	140,653	60	7.36
Tennessee (38):							
Anderson	621	1,949	2,570	37,278	17,980	48	7.00
Bledsoe	189	351	540	8,232	3,666	45	6.79
Campbell	628	3,276	3,904	56,136	29,780	53	7.62
Cannon	46	237	283	3,858	1,901	49	6.72
Chester	164	230	394	6,275	2,365	38	6.00
Claiborne	601	1,909	2,510	34,917	17,869	51	7.12
Cocke	196	904	1,100	15,138	7,884	52	7.17
Dyer	446	2,417	2,863	40,161	20,311	51	7.09
Fayette	118	6,128	6,246	76,424	46,424	61	7.43
Fentress	144	919	1,063	14,829	7,478	50	7.03
Grundy	217	542	759	11,232	5,536	49	7.29
Hamilton	2,496	3,284	5,780	88,076	35,548	40	6.15
Hancock	264	897	1,161	16,196	8,506	53	7.33
Hardeman	260	2,818	3,078	38,890	21,014	54	6.82
Hardin	301	890	1,191	18,922	8,108	43	6.81
Haywood	263	6,953	7,216	88,583	50,679	57	7.02
Henry	139	223	362	6,474	2,208	34	6.10
Knox	1,043	2,648	3,691	57,444	25,270	44	6.85
Lake	234	1,576	1,810	21,670	13,078	60	7.23
Lauderdale	323	3,902	4,225	55,642	30,682	55	7.26
Lawrence	173	467	640	10,297	4,257	41	6.65
Macon	76	186	262	4,404	1,832	42	6.99
Marion	406	1,229	1,635	24,001	11,174	47	6.83
McNairy	395	980	1,375	22,112	9,854	45	7.17
Meigs	43	186	229	3,124	1,551	50	6.77
Morgan	284	1,107	1,391	19,344	10,224	53	7.35
Pickett	50	253	303	4,044	2,222	55	7.33
Rutherford	302	471	773	10,025	4,553	45	5.89
Scott	729	2,338	3,067	45,596	21,122	46	6.89
Sequatchie	124	195	319	4,154	1,706	41	5.35
Sevier	109	309	418	6,232	3,044	49	7.28
Shelby	4,064	5,983	10,047	144,430	56,797	39	5.65
Smith	79	286	365	5,627	2,529	45	6.93
Sumner	134	474	608	8,461	4,249	50	6.99
Tipton	168	5,192	5,360	63,518	39,012	61	7.28
Trousdale	22	165	187	2,598	1,248	48	6.67
Weakley	138	242	380	6,252	2,508	40	6.60
Wilson	82	222	304	4,306	1,975	46	6.50
Total	16,071	62,338	78,409	1,084,902	536,144	49	6.84
Texas (2):							
El Paso	[1] 1,011	[1] 2,200	[1] 3,211	44,397	21,802	49	[1] 6.79
Tarrant	[1] 2,504	[1] 3,242	[1] 5,746	93,941	39,362	42	[1] 6.85
Total	[1] 3,515	[1] 5,442	[1] 8,957	138,338	61,164	44	[1] 6.83
Utah (20):							
Beaver (New)	30	0	30	762	216	28	7.20
Box Elder	113	17	130	2,636	840	32	6.46
Cache	179	120	299	6,209	2,213	36	7.40
Carbon	240	46	286	5,697	1,704	30	5.96
Davis	394	49	443	8,108	2,900	36	6.55
Emery	110	6	116	2,538	720	28	6.21
Garfield	84	15	99	2,057	612	30	6.18
Iron (New)	52	0	52	1,226	332	27	6.38
Juab	53	6	59	1,384	394	28	6.68
Kane	21	9	30	620	184	30	6.13
Millard	69	6	75	1,654	468	28	6.24
Morgan	18	0	18	384	120	31	6.67
Piute	53	2	55	1,224	352	29	6.40

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Utah—Continued							
Rich	7	2	9	$216	$60	28	$6.67
Sanpete	270	23	293	6,374	1,885	30	6.43
Sevier	143	15	158	3,310	968	29	6.13
Utah	1,364	108	1,472	28,938	9,649	33	6.56
Washington (New)	119	13	132	2,947	851	29	6.45
Wayne	14	0	14	328	88	27	6.29
Weber	1,855	170	2,025	39,970	13,027	33	6.43
Total	5,188	607	5,795	116,582	37,583	32	6.49
Vermont (1):							
St. Albans Welfare District	474	1,425	1,899	33,302	10,663	32	5.62
Virginia (7):							
Bristol (City)	358	507	865	13,326	5,732	43	6.63
Chesapeake (City)	637	512	1,149	18,646	7,785	42	6.78
Danville (City)	259	148	407	6,038	2,176	36	5.35
Dickenson	595	1,748	2,343	33,294	16,768	50	7.16
Lee	894	1,233	2,127	31,458	14,678	47	6.90
Norfolk	3,088	1,194	4,282	67,530	22,323	33	5.21
Wise	471	1,537	2,008	28,618	14,826	52	7.38
Total	6,302	6,879	13,181	198,910	84,288	42	6.39
Washington (23):							
Adams	118	54	172	[1] 3,164	[1] 1,139	[1] 36	[1] 6.62
Asotin	305	37	342	[1] 6,840	[1] 2,052	[1] 30	[1] 6.00
Benton	975	294	1,269	[1] 21,879	[1] 6,345	[1] 29	[1] 5.00
Clallam	447	247	694	[1] 13,650	[1] 4,095	[1] 30	[1] 5.90
Clark	1,478	310	1,788	[1] 38,407	[1] 10,370	[1] 27	[1] 5.80
Columbia	59	20	79	[1] 1,432	[1] 444	[1] 31	[1] 5.62
Cowlitz	872	406	1,278	[1] 26,078	[1] 8,345	[1] 32	[1] 6.53
Franklin	514	87	631	[1] 13,343	[1] 4,003	[1] 30	[1] 6.66
Garfield	17	16	33	[1] 707	[1] 198	[1] 28	[1] 6.00
Gray's Harbor	1,255	455	1,710	[1] 32,727	[1] 9,491	[1] 29	[1] 5.55
Jefferson	185	22	207	[1] 4,270	[1] 1,153	[1] 27	[1] 5.57
Kitsap	1,022	209	1,231	[1] 25,585	[1] 7,164	[1] 28	[1] 5.82
Klickitat	176	72	248	[1] 5,075	[1] 1,505	[1] 28	[1] 6.07
Lewis	875	333	1,208	[1] 27,178	[1] 7,610	[1] 28	[1] 6.30
Lincoln	57	19	76	[1] 1,657	[1] 464	[1] 28	[1] 6.10
Mason	230	66	296	[1] 5,327	[1] 1,545	[1] 29	[1] 5.22
Pacific	332	79	411	[1] 8,903	[2] 2,404	[1] 27	[1] 5.85
Skamania	125	151	276	[1] 4,140	[1] 1,325	[1] 32	[1] 4.80
Thruston	1,332	158	1,490	[1] 27,564	[1] 7,718	[1] 28	[1] 5.18
Wahkiakum	27	13	40	[1] 873	[1] 262	[1] 30	[1] 6.55
Walla Walla	882	216	1,098	[1] 22,039	[1] 6,171	[1] 28	[1] 5.62
Whitman	102	126	228	[1] 4,520	[1] 1,311	[1] 29	[1] 5.75
Yakima	5,080	963	6,043	[1] 118,781	[1] 33,264	[1] 28	[1] 5.50
Total	16,465	4,353	20,818	[1] 414,439	118,378	29	5.69
West Virginia (40):							
Barbour	806	326	1,132	19,746	8,476	43	7.49
Boone	2,798	375	3,173	56,882	22,376	39	7.05
Braxton	1,379	259	1,638	28,444	11,900	42	7.26
Cabell	1,893	263	2,156	40,738	15,162	37	7.03
Calhoun	756	110	866	14,782	6,164	42	7.12
Clay	1,481	491	1,972	34,010	14,548	43	7.38
Doddridge	255	70	325	5,438	2,430	45	7.48
Fayette	4,859	1,500	6,359	109,970	45,750	42	7.19
Gilmer	593	183	776	13,426	5,636	42	7.26
Greenbrier	1,299	515	1,814	30,886	13,426	43	7.40
Harrison	688	516	1,204	20,328	9,020	44	7.49
Jackson	788	198	986	17,246	7,056	41	7.16
Kanwaha	7,699	1,572	9,271	163,972	66,782	41	7.20
Lewis	664	162	826	14,050	6,082	43	7.36
Lincoln	3,496	434	3,930	69,712	28,030	40	7.13
Logan	5,755	620	6,375	112,320	44,282	39	6.95
Marion	934	329	1,263	22,662	9,056	40	7.17
Mason	535	298	833	14,086	6,298	45	7.56
McDowell	7,067	1,335	8,402	147,214	58,216	40	6.93
Mercer	3,201	623	3,824	69,752	27,760	40	7.26
Mingo	6,472	922	7,394	130,614	51,414	39	6.95

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
West Virginia—Continued							
Monongalia	504	224	728	$12,960	$5,458	42	$7.50
Monroe	746	133	879	15,438	6,248	40	7.11
Nicholas	1,115	637	1,752	30,176	13,176	44	7.52
Pendelton	261	84	345	5,846	2,592	44	7.51
Pocahontas	450	64	514	9,214	3,708	40	7.21
Preston	602	196	798	13,938	5,896	42	7.39
Putnam	650	186	836	14,604	6,274	43	7.50
Raleigh	3,889	1,163	5,052	90,300	36,740	41	7.27
Randolph	1,213	217	1,430	25,076	10,002	40	6.99
Roane	1,025	183	1,208	20,678	8,630	42	7.14
Summers	1,583	536	2,119	36,532	15,692	43	7.41
Taylor	345	150	495	8,630	3,590	42	7.25
Tucker	221	34	255	4,698	1,924	41	7.55
Upshur	692	238	930	16,434	6,676	41	7.18
Wayne	4,773	615	5,388	94,516	38,260	40	7.10
Webster	1,562	274	1,836	32,668	13,210	40	7.19
Wirt	118	58	176	3,040	1,366	45	7.76
Wood	745	367	1,112	19,954	8,586	43	7.72
Wyoming	2,644	624	3,268	57,742	23,628	41	7.23
Total	76,556	17,084	93,640	1,648,722	671,520	41	7.17
Wisconsin (18):							
Burnett	154	104	258	4,575	1,398	31	5.42
Crawford	175	288	463	8,202	2,821	34	6.09
Door (New)	107	99	206	3,557	1,101	31	5.34
Douglas	836	871	1,707	31,129	10,493	34	6.15
Dunn	195	376	571	8,083	2,705	33	4.74
Grant	306	180	486	9,269	2,738	30	5.63
Iron	49	130	179	3,549	1,038	29	5.80
Kewaunee (New)	28	15	43	842	244	29	5.67
Lafayette	99	118	217	3,657	1,239	34	5.71
Langlade	187	659	846	14,332	4,722	33	5.58
Milwaukee	12,059	2,900	14,959	253,728	75,751	30	5.06
Pepin	138	60	198	3,608	1,034	29	5.22
Pierce	1,138	112	250	4,305	1,308	30	5.23
Price	137	487	624	11,509	3,860	34	6.19
Rusk	222	275	497	10,367	3,250	31	6.54
St. Croix	72	89	161	2,803	844	30	5.24
Vernon	176	183	359	6,411	2,090	33	5.82
Waukesha	599	406	1,005	16,318	5,758	35	5.73
Total	15,677	7,352	23,029	396,244	122,394	31	5.31
Wyoming (23):							
Albany	117	155	272	4,664	1,603	34	5.89
Big Horn	214	293	507	8,741	3,109	36	6.13
Campbell	80	26	106	1,808	680	38	6.42
Carbon	398	312	710	11,793	4,412	37	216.
Converse	91	40	131	2,054	748	36	5.71
Crook	6	5	11	248	80	32	7.27
Fremont	150	142	292	5,675	1,885	33	6.46
Goshen	234	79	313	6,141	1,846	30	5.90
Hot Springs	70	43	113	2,024	640	32	5.66
Johnson	59	28	87	1,557	467	30	5.39
Laramie	775	334	1,109	19,719	6,303	32	5.68
Lincoln	30	11	41	890	240	27	5.85
Natrona	787	526	1,313	23,196	8,596	37	6.55
Niobrara	27	39	66	1,362	424	31	6.42
Park	181	92	273	4,564	1,470	32	5.38
Platte	95	76	171	3,152	980	31	5.73
Sheridan	412	107	519	10,407	3,131	30	6.03
Sublette	22	42	64	1,160	516	44	8.06
Sweetwater	307	147	454	7,937	2,963	37	6.53
Teton	14	0	14	322	80	25	5.71
Uinta	25	6	31	757	197	26	6.35
Washakie	180	99	279	4,582	1,568	34	5.62
Weston	44	103	147	2,522	1,082	43	7.36
Total	4,318	2,705	7,023	125,275	43,020	34	6.13
Grand total (645)	[1] 959,990	[1] 597,073	[1] 1,557,063	[1] 26,409,959	[1] 9,559,675	[1] 36	[1] 6.14

[1] Estimates.
[2] Combined with Central Falls, R.I.

Secretary FREEMAN. But today, I do not want to dwell on the details of program operations or statistics. Rather, I want to review the broad place and purpose of the program in the whole range of activities for which the Department of Agriculture is responsible.

This program is in the Department of Agriculture because it is a farm and food program.

It provides increased outlets for our food surpluses and helps raise farm income. Here, I do not refer to food surpluses in the narrow sense of the commodities we have under loan or in inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Rather, I refer to the excess capacity our farmers have to produce food—the food they could produce to their economic benefit, if the markets were available. And a larger market is available—it is the need for better diets among our low-income families. In effect—through the food stamp program—this committee and the whole Congress are building a bridge between those of our farmers who need larger markets and our poor families who need more and better food.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that we undertook a careful 3-year test of this program before we asked the Congress to provide continuing authority for it. During that test, we carefully studied its results to determine if, as a farm program, we would get the results we expected.

Those studies dramatically demonstrated the effectiveness of the food stamp approach.

Farm markets were expanded. A study in Detroit showed that food stamp families bought: 37 percent more meat, 32 percent more poultry, 67 percent more fresh fruit, 60 percent more fresh vegetables, 80 percent more fluid milk.

I could go on—these food stamp families used more grains—even though we had been donating cereal products to them before the food stamp program started.

If we want to enlarge domestic markets for grains, the best way to do it is to make it possible for low-income families to buy more livestock products. And the food stamp program does that.

That Detroit study showed that—with the same amount of Federal subsidiary—the food stamp program has a greater impact on farm income than does the direct donation of surplus foods.

The level of food consumption obtained among low-income families in Detroit—when we were providing surplus foods—provided a return of $1.75 per person per week to the farmer. Under the stamp program, the farmer's share increased to $2.01—a 15-percent increase.

Its successes as a farm program have been paralleled by its success as a food program.

It is a very valuable supplement to the restricted food budgets of our low-income families. It means more meat, more milk, more poultry, more fruits and vegetables for the food stamp family. And these are the protective foods that make for better diets and improved health

Our files are full of unsolicited reports from families concerning what the food stamp program has meant to them. Let me quote from an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal of September 30, 1966:

"But I can't raise a family of young-uns on three days work and $35 a week." So Mr. Collins, who has spent his whole life here in the Cumberland Mountains, counts heavily on help from Federal food stamps that can be used like cash at

the grocery store. Gesturing at his neatly-dressed eight-year-old boy, he says: "This one would still be eating bread and gravy for breakfast instead of eggs, milk and cereal if it weren't for those food stamps."

The food stamp program has been well administered. There have been no scandals. There has been no evidence of poor administration.

And again I would acknowledge the contribution of this committee in developing the basic framework of the program—as set forth in the Food Stamp Act of 1964. Among other things, this committee developed amendments to our original bill that more clearly and precisely defined program eligibility and that more precisely established the responsibility of States for proper program administration. Those amendments have stood the "test of time" and actual operating experience.

Finally, the program has acted as a stimulus to the entire economy of the community. The extra dollars that move into food stamp communities increase retail food sales by an average of 8 percent, according to studies. The retailer buys more food from the local wholesaler—many retailers report that they hire extra help, et cetera. So, these extra dollars turn around many times in the local community.

Again, let me quote from the Wall Street Journal article:

"My grocery business is like the old days when the coal mines were booming," says Merlin D. Smith who has run a country store in the county for 20 years.

As always, there are some misunderstandings about a new program.

First, there is some misunderstanding about the role of State and local governments and the control they excercise.

It is a cooperative Federal-State-local program. The Department of Agriculture cannot put a single program into operation anywhere. The States and localities must request it. In fact, it's a 100 percent voluntary program—for the States, for the localities, for the retail stores, and for the family it is designed to help.

The States set the eligibility standards and each family is certified by the local office of the State welfare agencies. The States and localities determine how and where the coupons are to be sold to participating families. And they must finance almost all of those certification and issuance costs.

Second, there is a misunderstanding that the food stamp program permits States to evade their responsibilities for the basic public assistance or general relief of the poor.

Families must continue to spend their own money for food—even though the families were getting their income from a public assistance or local relief grant. That is why we have a minimum purchase requirement—even for the family with very low and irregular income. It has been traditional for community resources—either public or private—to help families who find themselves in a short-term emergency. Thus, when we put a food stamp program into an area, we expect those community resources to finance the minimum purchase requirements for the family in an emergency.

So, the States and localities must continue to carry out their basic responsibilities for the relief of the poor. They cannot use the food stamp program as a back-door method of shifting that responsibility to the Department of Agriculture.

Third, some have felt that the States should finance 20 percent of the cost of the free coupons so that they may exercise proper control of the program.

If this change is made in the program, then most of the States will likely end their participation in the program, and go back to the distribution of surplus foods.

1. States continue to have serious difficulty providing sufficient funds to support their own public welfare programs. Some States—particularly the lower income States—are not now taking full advantage of available Federal public assistance funds because they have not been able to raise the tax funds required.

2. Major efforts are being made both by the Federal Government and the States to upgrade the level of welfare assistance to provide more adequately for the needs of the Nation's needy families. These efforts will further tax available financial resources within the States between now and the time States would be asked to assume cost-sharing responsibility for the food stamp program.

3. Welfare programs must provide for many pressing needs of poor families in addition to better nutrition through increased food consumption. The States' welfare programs must provide for all the needs of their needy families and State resources must be effectively allocated to that end. In fact, if States were now able to finance a public assistance program of adequate scope, we would not need a food stamp program.

4. The States have available to them a Federal food program which does not require cost sharing. By choosing to participate in the commodity distribution program they can continue to provide food assistance to needy families without assuming the financial burden tha twould be imposed on them by a cost sharing requirement in the food stamp program.

Finally, it is important that the appropriation authorities for the program be authorized for an additional 3 years. We believe our experience under the act demonstrates the wisdom of this committee and the Congress in establishing the principle of gradual progressive program expansion—with appropriation authorities specified for a 3-year period. This has meant that both the Department and cooperating State welfare agencies have had the time to gain experience and modify and adjust the program—based upon that experience. And it has permitted both the Department and the States to build the kind of administrative organization that is essential to effective and prudent program management and control.

The program has worked well because the States have been able to plan ahead, rather than on a year-to-year basis. And it was in recognition of this need that the Congress acted to provide the Department and the States a basis for forward planning—for 3 years—when the act was passed in 1964.

To now place the program on a year-to-year basis would mean less orderly program expansion and less effective administration. It would endanger the goals and objectives set forth by the Congress and the effective administration that we and the States have been able to achieve.

I urge the subcommittee to recommend a food stamp bill that will permit the program to continue and to expand—on the sound and workable basis embodied in the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary, for a very fine report.

Senator Young.

Senator YOUNG. How much is the amount of authorization?

Secretary FREEMAN. The amount of authorization that we currently have before the Congress is $195 million.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD P. DAVIS, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, CONSUMER FOOD PROGRAMS, CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. DAVIS. That is our budget request for 1968.

Secretary FREEMAN. A total of $140 million for the current fiscal rear; right?

Mr. DAVIS. Right.

Senator YOUNG. What is the authorization limit?

Secretary FREEMAN. There was no authorization limit in the basic legislation. That was left open to the Appropriation Committee establish the amount.

Senator YOUNG. I see.

Mr. DAVIS. In the bill before the committee.

Senator BOGGS. Should there be—is that your point, Senator—should not there be an authorization limit to cover the 3-year period if we go to the 3-year period, rather than an open——

Senator YOUNG. Well, there usually is; but I did not remember this case, whether there was any limitation.

Secretary FREEMAN. Am I wrong? Is there limitation in the basic legislation we have now?

Mr. DAVIS. In the bill as passed in 1964 there was a limitation for each of the 3 years for which appropriations were authorized.

Secretary FREEMAN. I stand corrected. I was wrong.

Mr. DAVIS. That, of course, runs out in June.

Senator YOUNG. You are now proposing that it be open end, with no authorization limitation?

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct, sir. The bill before the committee has no limitation on time or money.

Senator YOUNG. What did the House do in that respect?

Mr. DAVIS. They limited the appropriation authorization to 1 year and $195 million.

Senator YOUNG. Just 1 year?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Secretary FREEMAN. The amount was satisfactory, but the year limitation, I think, would not be constructive.

Senator YOUNG. I think it should be for a longer period, too.

Senator BOGGS. Yes, but my observation is that if you left it open end, you always run into a lot of trouble on the floor about it. It makes it easier if you put some figure in there.

Senator JORDAN. Any further questions?

Senator BOGGS. Well, getting back to the point, Mr. Secretary, that Senator Kennedy raised about your not being able to reach some of these people who have no means of coming up with the $2, for example—in the overall program when a State or one of its subdivisions requests to get into the program, are there certain criteria that they must comply with?

Secretary FREEMAN. The general rule on this is that the participant in the program will spend the amount to get the stamps that he has been spending for food before, and then the additional stamps that he gets will depend upon the difference between what he has been spending and what in that vicinity is determined as the amount of food that he should have to have an adequate nutritious diet.

So, if a person was, for example, on relief in the State of Minnesota, and he received $100 a month for relief and would be spending under that $20 a month but that if he was going to have a real adequate diet he should be spending $30 a month, he would then take the $20, and he would exchange that for $30 worth of stamps which he could use like money at the grocery store.

Senator BOGGS. I understand that. But now, how are you going to get to these people who must come up with the money to purchase any stamps? Is there not really an obligation of the county or State to try to provide them with some funds?

Secretary FREEMAN. I think that we would expect that every State or town in this Nation should see to it that nobody would starve to death.

Senator BOGGS. That is my point.

Secretary FREEMAN. And that would mean that everyone would get at least $2 a month for food.

Senator BOGGS. Right.

Secretary FREEMAN. And, therefore, we would take that $2 a month in Mississippi and it would be changed to $12 a month, increased four or five times in regard to food. However, we then face the practical problem that if they do not actually in some areas have a program, State or local, that gets $2 to people for food, what do you do then? And, in this instance, what we are considering is lowering that $2 level so that perhaps it would be 50 cents instead of $2, so then you would get, need to put in only that amount because somewhere or other this we are required to do because the law requires that the person should make a token, at least, contribution toward getting these stamps.

Senator BOGGS. I see.

Senator JORDAN. Anything further?

Senator BOGGS. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Young?

Senator YOUNG. No questions.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. We appreciate you being with us.

Secretary FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JORDAN. Mr. Graham, Mr. Harry Graham.

Mr. Harry Graham is the legislative representative of the National Grange.

Harry, we are always glad to have you. I always enjoy seeing you and hearing you.

STATEMENT OF HARRY L. GRAHAM, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am always glad to come before this committee. This is the first time this year, and this is a very important bill, and I have a very short statement on it.

Senator JORDAN. Do you not have some other information you would like to put in the record at this point?

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to add something to this statement.

Senator JORDAN. All right, you proceed as you wish.

Mr. GRAHAM. Since the statement will only take about 3 minutes, I think I will just read it.

Senator JORDAN. All right, that will be fine.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Food Stamp Act of 1964 was originally passed as somewhat of a pilot program and it, of course, had a termination date which is in 1967. It was anticipated that a number of States would want to use the program, but the requests for sharing in the program have exceeded original estimates, indicating the general approval of the operation of this program.

S. 953 by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable Robert C. Byrd, properly puts the program on the basis that it is not to be terminated until specifically done by the Congress, allowing for the orderly programing and budgeting not only by the Federal Government, but by the State and local governments involved.

At the same time, it provides for an expansion of the program on an orderly basis to cover the needs of those who are in the income brackets which properly and legally qualify them for receiving this assistance.

The Grange supported the original pilot project, we supported the Food Stamp Act of 1964, and we are happy to support S. 953 to put this on an expanded and more permanent basis.

One of the concerns of the Grange as it has surveyed this and previous programs was that the Nation was dependent upon the distribution of surplus food commodities. These were purchased by the Government at support levels, far below a fair price to the producers.

The Food Stamp Program has brought the procurement of food into the regular market channels where the recipients have access to the same food available to others in our society. The dual results of upgrading the diets by making essential food available, and the normalizing of the market system for food distribution were and are commendable and worthwhile objectives.

As Under Secretary Schnittker said last month in a speech before the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association:

> The steady expansion of the food stamp program is an important force in expanding markets. By the end of the current fiscal year, nearly 2 million persons will be involved. Much of the increase in spending for food will be for meat and other livestock products.

We are of the firm conviction that nobody in this United States should be permitted to go hungry as long as there is an abundance of food available and as long as we have great wealth this Nation so obviously possesses.

The passage of S. 953 would provide a practical means of making this food available to the needy people of our Nation. The Grange earnestly urges the approval of this legislation by the committee and the passage of the legislation by the Senate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of comments.

We did not add anything in our testimony concerning the matching funds by the State because that bill was not before the committee, although we anticipated that this question would arise. And, also,

we would point out the difference between the surplus food disposal program and this present program.

In the surplus food disposal—during the house hearing the question was asked about what foods were available at the present time for surplus disposal. I went back and dug out the answers to this. I do not have the list with me, but I would say with the exception of a little cheese and a little butter that very recently became available, that all the rest of it is cereals. It is either wheat or wheat products, rice or beans.

Senator JORDAN. Beets?

Mr. GRAHAM. Beans.

Senator JORDAN. Beans.

Mr. GRAHAM. So, basically it is a cereal diet at that point.

Now, this obviously is not an adequate diet, especially for children and especially for older people, the two groups that would most properly be the concern of the committee.

We point out that for children—that we have learned, and we have made some emphasis about this in terms of the foreign relief programs, that children with inadequate protein diets during the first 4 years of their life, suffer permanent damage to their learning capacity.

That is one of the great tragedies of the world, that not only is a child hungry, but that he is limited for all future time. It is true in India, it is also true in Mississippi or Harlem, or wherever the hungry child may be. And a balanced diet obviously is not only desirable, but I think it is a social necessity for us; otherwise we burden ourselves with people that are incapacitated in terms of their ability to learn skills through all the rest of their lives.

So, we simply perpetuate a problem by not getting the kind of food where it belong.

Now, we are beginning to solve this in school lunch programs, but this is too late. The damage has already been done for the children by the time they get to the school lunch.

Now, I think that in general, and the Grange has supported this principle, in terms of State sharing, where the project are socially desirable, the States should share and that the Federal Government has properly used the carrot-stick approach in order to get some of these projects accepted by the States. Roads, for instance. This is basically the responsibility of the State, and so we have used the enticement: If you will do such and such a thing in terms of roads, if you will contribute a certain amount, then we will give you a much larger amount. But this has been an enticement to do something that is desirable and may be necessary. But in some areas they could get along on the bumpy roads. I do not like to, and neither does anybody else, but we could get by.

Now, when you get into food, especially food for people that have no resources, this is not a desirable situation. This is a necessity of life. And I think we need to remember this, that the carrot-stick approach really is not quite so valid in terms of feeding people, as it is in building roads.

The question always arises about these people who cannot afford even the original cost of the food stamps. The States, I think, at this point, who do have the responsibility for keeping people from starving to death would be well-advised to spend some of this welfare money for food stamps because they just multiply their welfare money.

Senator Boggs. I agree.

Mr. Graham. They multiply at that point.

Senator Boggs. I think it is their responsibility. There should not be a single person without food under a system like this.

Mr. Graham. Of course there should not, and the cheapest way that the States feed the needy is to do it with this kind of system. We could save them more money that way than any other way we could do it. And I am concerned, and I think the Congress is concerned, I think the Nation is concerned about the loads that some of these States carry. This is where the big increase in expenditure comes. People talk about the increase in expenditures to the Federal Government. With the exception of something like the Vietnam project, there is no correlation between the increase of Federal expenditures and increase in population. We have held these expenditures almost constant—or relatively so, but we have had this tremendous increase in the cost of State government.

If you were a Governor, you would well know this problem.

This program, it seems to me, helps the two groups of States that are in most difficulty. One is the States with a high percentage of urban population. New York is the best example. It is just in fiscal problems all the time. It is just a cat and dog race to see who comes out ahead, and how in the world they can get the money to run the various services that are required for the State and especially a city like New York City. This becomes particularly acute when you get large numbers of indigent people that all of a sudden are plunked down into this society who had no origin there, but they are there and somebody has to take care of them.

On the other side of the coin, if you flip it over, other States from which these people came—basically rural, basically low-income, basically no resources, and where—according to some of the testimony that was given in the poverty program hearings, it was indicated that there are counties in some of the Southern States, and especially in the cutover land where if they spent every cent they could raise for tax money, they would not have enough for schools. If they would commit all their taxes, they would not have enough just for the schools.

Now, to try to impose this welfare load and all the rest of the loads on them, we are just imposing a load they are simply not able to carry. And this is where, as Dr. Rositer of Harvard says, we need some "social overhead capital" that is plowed into these areas, and the food stamp program is one of the ways of doing it and accomplishing another desirable objective, and that is just getting people well fed.

May I comment on this authorization because this is a program that extends further than the previous one. I think it should. I think the same reason for doing this is the one we used for passing the 4-year farm bill. It gives the States and local communities and everybody else a chance to plan just a little further ahead. You cannot set up this program overnight and you cannot terminate it overnight without a great deal of hardship. When it comes to authorization limitations, I think we ought to consider the rate of growth of the acceptance of these programs. The authorization of $195 million this year probably is not the proper authorization for next year. So it would seem to me that somebody could, on the basis of the figures and trends that we already have, project the authorization. Maybe it is 195 this year, and it seems to be acceptable, but maybe it ought to

be 225 next year and 275 the next year and 310 the next year. But we ought to recognize that this program is only so far in its relatively pilot stage, that it is going to grow, and to be fair to the people involved, it ought to grow. We should make it possible for this growth, so that we do not hamstring it by an authorization which says that this is fine but you cannot go any further, and a whole host of people that need these services would be left out.

These are the only extra comments I had left out.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Graham.

Senator Young?

Senator YOUNG. No questions.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Boggs.

Senator BOGGS. Thank you, Mr. Graham, for your testimony.

Senator JORDAN. Harry, that was a very fine presentation. I thoroughly agree. I think the Federal Government not only has an obligation and a duty, but it is nothing but right that somehow or other we should see that ample food is gotten to every person in the United States. And we have been very magnanimous in our treatment of foreign countries, a great deal, and properly so. I have supported every one of those programs——

Mr. GRAHAM. So have we.

Senator JORDAN (continuing). And you have, too, and your organization has, but there is an old proverb saying that charity begins at home. And it certainly is applicable in this case. And if we have anybody that is really hungry, why, we should see that he is fed—I mean amply fed, not just——

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, that is correct.

Senator JORDAN (continuing). The basic commodities. They are good, but you need more than that.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is unbelievable that we should have hungry people in a land with the productive capacity of these United States. It is incredible and indefensible any way you put it, because we have the food, and even if we have not, we can doggone well produce it.

Senator JORDAN. That is right. Thank you very much. We appreciate your being with us today.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Reuben Johnson.

Mr. Johnson, we will be glad to hear you. Mr. Johnson is the director of the legislative services, National Farmers Union.

Mr. Johnson, we are glad to have you, sir, and you may proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF REUBEN L. JOHNSON, DIRECTOR, LEGISLATIVE SERVICES, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Boggs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask permission to submit my statement for the record.

Senator JORDAN. You may do so.

Mr. JOHNSON. Rather than burden you here with a lot of additional testimony, which will be repetitious of many of the comments made by Mr. Harry Graham, I would just like to subscribe to the comments that he made to the committee and to say that this is just one more example where we farm organizations can point to an area of agreement.

Contrary to the view of farm organizations that is sometimes presented there are a number of areas of agreement between some of us in organized agriculture, and this certainly is one of them.

I would like to especially say that we subscribe wholeheartedly to the comments made by the Grange concerning the authorization for the program.

I would like to suggest to the committee that the outlook is for a continuation of this program over a really long time, and I believe that the provisions of Senator Byrd's bill, which would make this program a permanent program, unless ended by the Congress, has a great deal of merit.

I would just like to also inject one other comment.

We have recently had a fly-in program involving about 100 cotton farmers from Texas. These men, who were also represented at our convention at Oklahoma City, have decided that we ought to be using some of our huge surplus of cotton to alleviate the need that exists for cotton bedding. We have been talking about food here, and there was one brief mention made as to the lack of clothing in Mississippi. Certainly we feel that some type of direct distribution program of cotton bedding, including mattresses, would be worthwhile. Maybe we could use the Job Corps program to help process some of this surplus cotton into mattresses and comforts and bedding. I was told by a representative of the Department of Agriculture that went to Mississippi recently that some of the people he visited were literally sleeping in a bed of rags, just crawling down in a bed of rags like an animal would burrow in. And in many instances, people are sleeping on the floor. And children are not in school because of the lack of clothing.

Now, while the direct distribution program would lend itself admirably to a cotton mattress or comfort, in such a program there would be, in my opinion, justification for a cotton stamp program for children's clothing to be administered very similarly to the way that we administer the food stamp program. In other words, the various sizes of clothing would make it impractical to proceed to distribute clothing through a direct distribution program, but would be extremely practical and realistic if stamps were provided needy families with children that were out of school because they did not have adequate clothing.

I do not think there was a need for a great amount of money here, but I know there are families that need this type of program.

You need not worry about support from farm people for both the food stamp and the cotton stamp for cotton mattress program, because the support is out there, and I believe also that this is one area where farmers and their city counterparts look with unanimity on the worthwhileness of this kind of effort.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Mr. Dechant's statement submitted for the record is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF TONY T. DECHANT, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, when the pilot Food Stamp Program was initiated by this Administration in eight selected areas of the country in 1961 an important objective of the legislative program of the Farmers Union was achieved. The success of this initial program resulted in public demand for its extension on a pilot basis to other areas. By June 30, 1967, the Food Stamp Program will be serving over 800 areas in 41 states. This compares with some 209

areas in 37 States and the District of Columbia which were taking part in the program a year ago. The public acceptance of this program has resulted in consideration of additional areas to be added as funds become available.

Career employees of the Department of Agriculture who are administering the Food Stamp Program as well as other programs with the objective of increasing the utilization of agricultural commodities and upgrading the diets of the needy, are to be commended for the outstanding success of the Food Stamp Program. They have been successful in developing the techniques of making the program practical and workable from a standpoint of administration. In addition, a series of studies have been made under their direction which dramatically illustrate the benefits that have accrued under this program to farmers and to low-income families and individuals.

The fact that current expenditures of needy families for food is augmented through the Food Stamp Plan makes it possible for a family participating in the program to substantially upgrade their diet. For example, animal products such as meat, poultry, fresh milk and eggs and fruits and vegetables accounted for more than 80% of the gains in food consumption in the areas surveyed several years ago. These are the foods most needed for proper nutrition and which are difficult to distribute in the conventional manner.

Taking a sample of retail food stores in the original eight pilot food programs, the Department of Agriculture has demonstrated that the dollar value of food sales increased by 8% under the Food Stamp Program. The retail outlets included in this survey represented an estimated 50–85% of the total retail food sales in all of the original eight pilot areas except Detroit.

It was found in the Detroit area that meat consumption among the recipients of food stamps increased by one pound per person per week from 2¾ pounds to 3¾ pounds. One pound of meat is equal to approximately six pounds of feed grains. In the Detroit area, also, poultry consumption among recipients of food stamps increased by ⅓ pound per person per week. This is equivalent to approximately one pound of feed grains.

It is clearly demonstrated, from this early survey as well as later surveys, that the Food Stamp Plan is upgrading diets of the needy at the same time it has made possible increased utilization of feed grains.

While these increases in meat consumption were taking place, surveys show that consumption of cereal products remained at approximately the same level as under the direct distribution program.

It is also clear, Mr. Chairman, that farmers have a stake in the rapid expansion of this program because of the strengthening of markets for a broad range of food items, a number of which remain in surplus supply.

S. 953, introduced by Senator Robert C. Byrd (D–W. Va.), would make possible the expansion of the Food Stamp Porgram and give the program permanent status. We believe the demonstrated worth of the program warrants the full and unanimous support of all the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The farmers of this nation have supported on many occasions important legislation under consideration by this distinguished Committee to expand the utilization of food, both in the United States and to needy people abroad.

Based on my discussion with farm people throughout this country, I can think of no legislative area in which there is a stronger interest than in programs that have increased the use of food in schools, in institutions and to individual families both here in the United States and abroad. I, therefore, respectfully urge the Committee to give S. 953 its strong approval.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear before the Committee and will be happy to respond to any questions that Members of the Committee may have.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much.

Senator BOGGS. Do you have any questions?

Senator BOGGS. No, I have no questions. I thank you, too, Mr. Johnson.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much for that fine statement.

Mrs. Mitchiner.

Mrs. Mitchiner is director of the division of public assistance, State board of public welfare, of Raleigh, N.C., and that is a great State you are representing there. We are mighty glad you came up, and Mrs. Mitchiner is representing the American Public Welfare Association this morning.

Mrs. MITCHINER. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. And we would be glad to have you proceed any way you like, Mrs. Mitchiner.

Mrs. MITCHINER. I would like to read my statement. It is very brief.

Senator JORDAN. Fine. Incidentally, did you have anyone with you that you wanted to have recorded as being here?

Mrs. MITCHINER. Well, Mr. Harold Hagen, who is the Washington representative for the American Public Welfare Association, is here with me.

Senator JORDAN. Does he have a statement to make?

Mrs. MITCHINER. No; this is the statement.

Senator JORDAN. All right; fine.

Senator BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, before Mrs. Mitchiner proceeds, I want to ask permission to be excused because I do have a commitment I must keep at 11 o'clock. I will read your testimony very carefully, and I thank you, too, for being here today.

Mrs. MITCHINER. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Senator Boggs. I appreciate your being here for the first part of this hearing.

Senator BOGGS. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Mrs. Mitchiner, that is one of our problems here. We all have many duties to be different places, and we just have to do it the very best we can, but it will all be in the record and available to every member of this committee.

Mrs. MITCHINER. I will proceed as quickly as I can.

Senator JORDAN. Fine.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MYRA J. MITCHINER, AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION, RALEIGH, N.C.

Mrs. MITCHINER. I would like to state that the American Public Welfare Association is the national membership organization representing the field of public welfare. Included in the membership of the association are State and local departments of public welfare which have the responsibility for the certification of eligibility and certain other administrative functions in connection with the food stamp program. For this reason, as well as the fact that the food stamp program and the public welfare program are closely interrelated, we have a direct interest in the legislation now before your committee.

Our general view of the food stamp program as now administered is a positive one. Through cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, low-income families, including not only those families receiving public assistance through the categorical assistance programs, but other needy persons have been able to improve their standard of living and safeguard the health of themselves and their children through better nutrition. The categorical public assistance programs are limited to helping only about 7½ million of the Nation's 32 to 34 million poverty-stricken people. The remaining millions of persons, though poor, do not have the added misfortune, which would qualify them for public assistance payments, of being blind, totally disabled, widowed, or deserted with dependent children, or over 65 years of age. And yet, their need, particularly for the basic item, food, is just as great, and quite often even greater. Those counties and cities

which have been fortunate enough to participate in the food stamp program are, through the provisions of the program, able to reach out and help many of these other needy persons and provide some assistance directly in one of the areas of greatest need, the need for an adequate diet. Not only does the food stamp program provide public welfare with a means of reaching many who were heretofore unreachable, but, through the requirement that these families convert their existing food dollars to food stamps, an assurance is provided that the food assistance is received in the form for which it was intended. This guard against substitution of food dollars for other necessities or nonessentials insures, without exception, the availability of a more adequate and nutritional diet for participating families. Research has shown that, while the consumption of grains and cereals of low-income families remains relatively stable, about 80 percent of their increased consumption when receiving benefits of the food stamp program is in meat and meat products, fruits and vegetables.

Many of these families have become so accustomed to a "beans and potatoes" diet that it is difficult for them to adjust their purchasing habits to a balanced, more nutritional diet. In many communities cooperative efforts are being made by representatives of Consumer and Marketing Service, Cooperative Extension Service, Health and Welfare, to establish nutrition education committees to assist these families in proper management of the additional food dollars provided by the program.

Although the program inproves the conditions of low-income families, it should be remembered that it also stimulates and increases the flow of food products from the Nation's farms through normal commercial channels. Thus, thousands of persons who are nonindigent but who derive their livelihood from agricultural interests, also benefit from food stamp activities. Research conducted in one test area has shown that the returns to farmers alone from food purchased by low-income families rose from $1.75 per person to $2.01, or an increase of approximately 15 percent. Other groups which benefit are food merchants, food processors, banks, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the remainder of my remarks to one of the amendments to the Food Stamp Act proposed by the House Agriculture Committee: That of requiring, effective July 1, 1969, each participating State or political subdivision to pay 20 percent of the cost of the free stamps distributed to eligible households. It is the position of the American Public Welfare Association that this amendment will place the food stamp program in great jeopardy and will, in effect, reduce participation, and in some areas, complete withdrawal, from the program. This, in our opinion, would be retrogression on the part of a nation whose philosophy is firmly rooted in a belief in the worth of the individual and committed to all-out efforts to help deprived individuals and families improve their general conditions.

It is universally known that States find it difficult to support their basic public assistance programs because of the lack of sufficient State and local revenues. In fact, one of the advantages of the food stamp program is the elevation of the living standards of the recipients. Actually, as has been said earlier, one of the reasons that a Federal food assistance program is needed is related to States' inability to

raise sufficient revenue for the basic ongoing public assistance programs. In fact, individual and family public assistance budgets generally cover only minimum subsistence amounts for food, clothing, rent, utilities, and, in some few States, other recognized basic needs. When fixed-expense items, such as rent and utilities, exceed a State's maximum allowance in the public assistance budget, then the amount for food is the only flexible item from which to draw. Consequently, quantity and quality of food are reduced. Too, many States cannot even meet the full cost of minimum food allowances as set by their own standard for health. How, then, can they be expected to participate financially in the much-needed food stamp program when they cannot "cough up" sufficient funds to meet food costs in their basic public assistance programs?

The Commissioner of the Department of Public Welfare in Mississippi has said:

> While Mississippi has supported public welfare to the extent of the State's financial ability to do so, we must recognize that welfare checks in our State are still too low in view of the present cost of living.

Mississippi has a large food stamp program. By June 1, 1967, there will be 38 counties in that State which will have the program in operation. Most of these counties are either the larger and wealthier counties or some of the smaller wealthier counties. The poorer counties where, no doubt, the need is greater, cannot afford the program. The 38 food stamp counties in Mississippi constitute over half of that State's population. If the amendment requiring States to pay 20 percent of the cost of bonus coupons is enacted into law, it would cost Mississippi an estimated $1,300,000 per year for the 38 counties in the program on June 1, 1967, without consideration of adding more counties desiring to enter the program. Mississippi's commissioner continues:

> If our State has to pay 20 percent of the bonus coupons in addition to the present costs of administration being paid by the counties, we see no way that the food stamp program could be continued in Mississippi. Due to our limited general fund revenues, neither our State nor counties could separately or collectively financially afford a food stamp program that would cost this amount.

The commissioner of public welfare in Louisiana has stated:

> According to information now available to use, we estimate that if this proposed legislation is enacted into law, it would cost Louisiana an additional one million, two hundred thousand dollars annually to operate the present program now in operation.

In addition, the Louisiana State Board of Public Welfare at its regular monthly meeting on April 12, 1967, passed a resolution including the following statement:

> Therefore be it resolved, that due to the serious financial condition of Louisiana at the present time, and in the foreseeable future, if the present proposal is put into effect, the cost would be more than the State could bear and would therefore jeopardize the entire program in Louisiana.

The State Director of the Ohio Department of Public Welfare wired:

> Ohio is very much concerned about proposed legislation relating to Food Stamp Program. The requirement for state to meet 20 percent of cost of bonus stamps would result in drastic curtailment of what has been a most successful program.

The State of Tennessee where 51 counties are approved for participation in the food stamp program, the State Commissioner of Public Welfare states:

> The amendment which the House Committee on Agriculture made to H.R. 1318 . . . would in my opinion be disastrous for the program here in this State. At the present rate of participation this would mean that the State of Tennessee would be required to contribute approximately one and one-half million dollars annually.

In North Carolina where we have 22 counties participating in the program, the effect of the amendment would result in a need for additional funds in excess of $900,000. The public welfare program in North Carolina is locally administered, Mr. Chairman, as you know, and State supervised. Consequently, at least a portion of this financial burden would have to be passed on to the counties with the probable result that many counties would have to terminate the program.

There seems to be an assumption on the part of some people that States and localities do not now participate in the cost of the food stamp program. This is erroneous. The Food Stamp Act of 1964 requires State and local financial participation for the purposes of administration. I would like to cite an example of one county in North Carolina currently participating in the program. This small, rural, county has a population of only 24,350 persons. The county's share of the administrative expenses currently amounts to approximately $6,000 per year. This is county money. In addition, a similar amount is contributed from State funds. Enactment of the 20-percent amendment would increase the burden on this county by approximately $40,000 per year. The point we are emphasizing here is the fact that States and localities are now participating in the cost of the food stamp program.

It is a fact of life that many of the poorer States cannot afford to pay the full cost of need established by their own standards in their ongoing public assistance programs. Other States like Illinois, where need is met in full and the States' average public assistance payments exceed the Federal matching formula, the difference is paid from State funds. An additional requirement to finance 20 percent of the cost of the bonus food stamps distributed in such States would penalize those States which are already carrying a disproportionate share of financing. It is completely unrealistic to assume that States can pick up this additional fiscal responsibility, and some States and localities would be forced to forgo the advantages of the food stamp program.

Since this statement was prepared, Mr. Chairman, we have heard from three other States. Pennsylvania has 29 counties with 12 additional counties planning to enter the program. And according to their State commissioner, the amendment for 20 percent of the cost of the free stamps would require in excess of $1.5 million additional money in Pennsylvania.

In Kentucky, where there are 54 counties currently in the program, the amendment would require an additional $1,470,000.

We also had a letter from the director in Wyoming opposing the amendment and saying that the Governor of Wyoming had gone on record as opposing the amendment.

In relation to the fact that some States have been unable to meet the full amount of need as determined on the basis of a reasonable assistance budget, we call your attention to H.R. 5710, the Social

Security Amendments of 1967, which include a Federal requirement for States to meet the full amount of need as determined by the State. Interestingly enough, the effective date of this amendment to the Social Security Act and the effective date of the proposed amendment to the Food Stamp Act is one and the same, July 1, 1969. The American Public Welfare Association has already gone on record as strongly supporting the establishment of a Federal requirement for the payment of the full amount of need as determined on the basis of a reasonable budget. In our opinion this step forward must be taken. The additional requirement for States to meet 20 percent of the cost of the bonus food coupons in the food stamp program would have a direct effect on their ability to meet the requirement as proposed in the amendments to the Social Security Act. Consequently, it is clear that some States would be forced to drop the food stamp program.

I would like to make a personal observation for your consideration. The public welfare program is an all-pervasive one, touching the lives of millions of people in our country. Much legislation is considered and in fact, is enacted which has a direct effect on the total public welfare program, without full consideration of the effect of implementation at the grassroots level. Several examples come to mind. For instance, the amendments to title V of the Economic Opportunity Act involving the Department of Labor; the Food Stamp Act of 1964 itself which, in effect, gave legal responsibility for certification of need to the public welfare agency; the 1966 Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as well as the amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act. Now, we agree with the purposes and functions of all of these programs, and we believe it appropriate that efforts be coordinated in furthering any program which will improve and uplift the general conditions of millions of our poor people because no one agency of Government knows and understands needy, deprived, and uneducated families better than public welfare does. It is our firm belief that public welfare should be involved; however, we feel strongly that public welfare is too frequently handed responsibility without consultation with us and without financial provision to carry out our obligations.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the American Public Welfare Association, I wish to express appreciation to you and this committee for the opportunity of appearing before you. Again, I wish to state that it is our opinion that the food stamp program as presently administered has proven highly successful, has been well accepted, and has made a great contribution to the welfare of the Nation. In public welfare, it has given us a long-awaited opportunity to extend services to a portion of the millions of needy persons outside the public assistance categories and to provide some help in at least one of their many areas of deprivation.

Because of the positive response across the Nation to the food stamp program, we urge your consideration in continuing the program with an adequate appropriation for future expansion. We also ask particularly for your support in removing the amendment which would require States to pay 20 percent of the cost of the bonus stamps.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Mitchiner. We are delighted to have you here, because I know that you are thoroughly familiar with this whole program and the—every other phase of welfare, because you have done a very effective and fine job in my home State.

Mrs. MITCHINER. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. And I believe are at the front ranks of doing an excellent job in the welfare field.

I notice on this table here that North Carolina last year received $9.5 million for the food stamps, but the State of North Carolina and the counties, as I pointed out, contributed $665,000.

Now, if this 20 percent were added on there, it would be $1.9 million instead of $665,000.

Mrs. MITCHINER. Yes.

Senator JORDAN. And I know, as you well know—and the same thing prevails in other States—that a lot of counties are still not able to raise very much. That would jump theirs up to $2.5 million.

Mrs. MITCHINER. That is right.

Senator JORDAN. It was interesting to note Ohio is the largest recipient of this program. They got $25 million, and their contribution was $1,650,000 in the program. But Mississippi is next. We have been hearing an awful lot of Mississippi. Now, I know they have a lot of problems, but they had $23 million last year in this program, so they are participating rather freely. They are the next largest—25 million in Ohio and 23 million in Mississippi, but at the same time Mississippi put $1,600,000 in it herself.

Mrs. MITCHINER. This is right.

Senator JORDAN. On the other hand, if they jumped to 20 percent, they would take $4,600,000, and that would be a tremendous burden on a State that is having as much problems as they are right now.

Mrs. MITCHINER. Mr. Chairman, may I comment on a question that came up in the earlier testimony relating to what happens when people do not have any income.

Senator JORDAN. Why, indeed, we would be glad to hear you.

Mrs. MITCHINER. I can talk only about North Carolina, because this is the program that I am most familiar with.

We do not have a State general assistance program. Now, the general assistance program is the program from which you can help people who do not meet the categorical assistance requirements for eligibility, that is, old-age assistance, aid to families with dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, in which there is Federal financial participation.

North Carolina does not have a State general assistance program. Many counties do have a county general assistance appropriation. This is money appropriated by the county commissioners. It is never enough to take care of emergency situations where there is illness or where there is some crisis. And in some counties it is necessary for the country director of public welfare to secure individual approval of the county commissioners before general assistance can be made available to a family in need.

And this is, as was said so graphically this morning, a real problem in the area of the food stamp program because these people do not have the money with which to buy the stamps.

Another point that was made earlier this morning seemed to indicate that the same type of certification procedures are not carried out in public welfare in the direct distribution program as in the food stamp program.

This may be true in other States, but in North Carolina we follow the same method of determining eligibility for the direct distribution of surplus commodities as we do for food stamps.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Aiken, I am delighted you got here before this hearing was over because you are one of the "daddies" of this program. You have been advocating it for many, many years, and you have done a great deal to bring it into being.

Earlier we had Senator Kennedy, that is, Robert Kennedy, who testified, and Secretary Freeman, and Reuben Johnson more or less just sanctioned what Harry Graham said, and now we have Mrs. Mitchiner here. And I will be glad to hear from you in any comments or questions you wish to make.

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF VERMONT

Senator AIKEN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have no prepared comments.

My first experience with the food stamp program was about 1939, I believe, when it was tried out in Vermont and apparently worked the best of any of the recovery programs of that day. That was the reason, when I came down here in 1941—it might have been 1943—I joined Senator LaFollette of Wisconsin in introducing a bill to reestablish the program. We kept it up as long as he lived, and then Senator Young and one or two others cosponsored it with me until 1964. That year Mrs. Sullivan in the House introduced it, and it seemed like a good idea to let the House pass it first, and that worked.

It has now been established in Vermont for about 3 years. It has worked exceptionally well and the cost has not been prohibitive.

Senator JORDAN. Vermont got $750,000 last year, and their contribution was $52,500 that the counties and State had to contribute. Now, if 20 percent were added to your State, Senator, that would jump it up $150,000, and that would be quite a burden on your population.

Senator AIKEN. Yes. And we have to understand if it is discontinued the State would have to pay more for a certain percentage who now benefit from it. Furthermore, when you eliminate the contributions of food, usually surplus, lower cost food, it not only impairs the diet but does not reduce the cost of the Federal Government too much.

So it has worked better than anything else in this field.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Byrd of Virginia was here part of the time this morning, Senator Boggs, and Senator Young was here, and we had a good representation of the subcommittee.

Senator AIKEN. I am not on your subcommittee——

Senator JORDAN. I know you are not, but you are always a very valued and welcome member. You know, we do not go exactly by the rules. Anybody on the committee can come and offer any suggestions, and we take them, and we get a lot of good information that way.

Senator AIKEN. In fact, our public welfare commissioner in Vermont, Mr. Wackerman, who is one of the best in the country——

Mrs. MITCHINER. Yes; we know him.

Senator AIKEN (continuing). Told me last time I was home that he would like to see it extended to the whole State and not cover just part of it. They have much better diets through the food stamp program than they had under the surplus food distribution program.

We used to find cornmeal that was given them out on the dump somewhere.

Senator JORDAN. They were not very hungry then.

Senator AIKEN. They were not that hungry. And further than that, where they pay a substantial part of the cost themselves, it does make them stand straighter.

Mrs. MITCHINER. It has a psychological effect.

Senator AIKEN. They walk a little straighter.

Senator JORDAN. They do. Fine.

Thank you, Mrs. Mitchiner.

When, are you going back home?

Mrs. MITCHINER. I am going back this afternoon.

Senator JORDAN. Well, keep them straight until I can get home this weekend, will you?

Mrs. MITCHINER. All right, thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you so much for coming.

Mrs. Hamer.

You may have a seat anywhere you like along here, Mrs. Hamer. I believe you are representing the National Council of Churches.

Mrs. HAMER. Yes, and the people of Mississippi.

Senator JORDAN. All right; will you give your full name and your address, and whom you are representing, and also those who are with you this morning.

STATEMENT OF MRS. FANNIE LOU HAMER, COMMISSION ON THE DELTA MINISTRY, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST, RULEVILLE, MISS.

Mrs. HAMER. My name is Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer. I am a native of Mississippi. I exist at 626 East Leaviat Street, Ruleville, Miss. I am a member of the Commission on the Delta Ministry of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. I am speaking only as a member of the commission, as no one can speak for all the member churches of the National Council of Churches.

Senator JORDAN. Do you have any statement to present for the record?

Mrs. HAMER. I had this statement I can submit. We have copies of it.

Senator JORDAN. Fine, fine. I know Mr. Moore was expecting to be here.

Mrs. HAMER. Mr. Moore is sick, and he asked me to come.

Senator JORDAN. Yes; I understand. I am sorry he is sick. I hope he will soon be better.

Mrs. HAMER. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. You may proceed, and the statement will go into the record.

Mrs. HAMER. Mr. Chairman, the National Council of Churches, as an agency for cooperative witness and service of 34 Protestant and Orthodox churches in the United States, appreciates this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture of the U.S. Senate its concern for the disadvantaged in the State of Mississippi.

The National Council of Churches operates an extensive mission and service program in Mississippi entitled "The Delta Ministry." Daily contact with scores of the most poor indicate to us that a crisis is impending. A particular problem has arisen because of the changeover from food commodity distribution to the food stamp plan. Although the food stamp plan has much to commend itself, under the present guidelines it would work an undue hardship upon those who have no cash to purchase the stamps.

One hundred thousand more people in Mississippi will be out of work in 1967, according to the noted USDA analyst, Dr. Calvin Beale of Washington, D.C. This loss of work is a result of further mechanization in cotton. Many of those out of work will be permitted to remain on the plantations, but will have no cash income. The changeover from the distribution of surplus commodity food to the purchase of food stamps will result in further suffering for the multitudes of the poor in Mississippi. Unless cash is provided or the payment waived, the people will go hungry. To protest inequity, a rally of 800 people occurred in January at Cleveland, Miss. During the week of March 13, Mr. Neil Carter of the USDA Consumer and Marketing Service heard testimony from more than 12 families in Tallahatchie County to the effect that they, and scores of their neighbors, had no cash to purchase food stamps. On April 14, another team from the USDA heard testimony and received over 100 affidavits from people who have no cash income.

The Reverend James F. McRee of 341 Cameron, Canton, Miss., president of the Madison County Movement, says:

People don't have money to purchase stamps. Not as many people buy food stamps as received surplus commodities. I would estimate two-thirds of the people who reeeived commodities can't afford stamps. Some people can't even buy stamps on the two-week basis, because they don't have the money to buy the stamps on a regular basis. If you don't buy the stamps twice in a row you are told you have to reapply. A lot of people just quit the program completely because they would rather let it go than mess with the red tape.

Mrs. Mildred Cosey of Route 2, Box 110B, Vicksburg, Miss., says:

I aceompanied my neighbor, Mrs. Willie Mac Thomas, to the Vieksburg food stamp office. When she didn't buy stamps they told her she wasn't going to get no more stamps. She said she owed bills and couldn't buy stamps. Later she reeeived a letter stating she was not going to get stamps any more. She used to receive commodities for her children, who go to school. She is a widow and receives a soeial security check, but no welfare.

I carried another lady to the food stamp office in Vicksburg by the name of Mrs. Sophia Ransifier. She lived in the rurals and received disability and her husband received aid to the blind. She was getting commodities, but when she went to buy food stamps, she wasn't able to buy the stamps.

Mr. Eddie Thomas, 2217 Letitia St., Vicksburg, Miss., says:

I attended a meeting April 3 in Beechwood, Mississippi, outside of Vicksburg, and the people there said they didn't like the food stamp program because they couldn't afford them. One lady, Mrs. Caroina Saunders, has six children and gets ADC help. She said the welfare worker told her she would have her ADC cut if she went out and got work. Yet when she put cash in for those stamps, she didn't have enough money for other expenses. She was well pleased with the return she got with the stamps, but she said she had no money left after buying the stamps. She has to clothe those children and pay other bills but she can't afford to take eare of those things now.

The Country Board of Supervisors brought in the stamps but they didn't tell nobody about it. Later I spoke with them and they told me that if there were 20 people who had eomplaints, the U.S. Agriculture Department would come

down. But they haven't come down yet. The food stamp program began here last February.

We also had a delegation of eight people who complained about the food stamps to the man in the Vicksburg Food Stamp Office. But so far, everything is the same.

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. has consistently expressed its concern for public assistance programs. In a policy statement adopted by the general board on June 4, 1958, it was stated:

The primary objective of public assistance programs is to furnish monetary assistance to persons in accordance with the determined degree of their economic need.

For the people dependent on all of these programs there is universal need for an improvement in the standards of assistance so that health and decency may be maintained. The churches have a vital role to play in raising these standards, and churches need to work for the elimination of all inequitable and punitive policies.

Many of the counties in Mississippi that are starting the food stamp program have not told the poor people about it. They are just signing people up when they come to get commodities. And they are not explaining to poor people how the program works. Six counties began the stamp program in January and eight more have begun in February and March.

In some counties poor people are being told they will lose their welfare checks if they do not sign up for food stamps. A very bad part of the program is that people must pay for a month's stamps all at one time. Many people do not have that much money together at one time.

Some people who will be buying the food stamps are not asked if they want the program. In many counties people do not even know that their county supervisors have voted to have a stamp program.

Some county supervisors want the food stamp program because it does not cost the county as much money to operate as the commodity program does.

Also, many businessmen and store owners want food stamps because they will make much more money if poor people have to buy food at stores rather than getting commodities.

People who have seen the food stamp program in action say that these things sometimes happen:

—Store owners sometimes accept stamps only for the most high-priced brands.

—Retail prices often are raised on the days when stamps are being traded.

—Public meetings to explain the program to poor people are not held as the Federal Government says they should be.

—County supervisors do not tell poor people that they have voted to have food stamps instead of commodities.

—People are told they will lose their welfare checks if they do not sign up for stamps.

Many poor people in Mississippi, and the delta in particular, cannot participate in this program because they do not have money. With commodities cut off they will not have any food. Alternatives include:

—Providing a given amount of free or bonus stamps to people under a certain income.

—A return to a program providing free commodities to people who need them.

—An integrated staff at all levels, whatever the program.

—In counties with food stamps, commodities issued to the very poor under the emergency provisions of the food stamp law; certainly an emergency exists.

—Strict adherence to the guidelines by management and store owners, with the burden of enforcement, not upon the recipients, but upon the Federal and State agencies.

—Desegregation of county welfare offices, which, as part of these programs, receive Federal money and are in violation of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The General Board of the National Council of Churches, on December 9, 1960, in a resolution entitled "Ethical Issue in the International Age of Agriculture," concluded:

> Our Lord taught his disciples to pray, "Give us this day our daily bread." Christians should continue to seek to achieve the goal implied in this prayer by breaking the barriers which persist between agricultural abundance and human need. Through their informed and sustained efforts toward this high goal Christians will thereby serve Him who provides and cares for His children everywhere.

May I make one other comment, Mr. Chairman?

Senator JORDAN. You certainly may.

Mrs. HAMER. Mr. Chairman, we would hope that something is done about the situation in the State of Mississippi where people not only have not been able to buy the stamps, but we have had people unable to pay 50 cents to go pick up the commodities with the free stamp programs.

Thank you very much.

Senator JORDAN. Well, thank you very much. We appreciate your being here and your statement. It will be included in its entirety in the record.

Do any of your friends wish to make a statement?

Mrs. HORN. Yes. I am Etta Horn from the District of Columbia.

Senator JORDAN. You are who?

Mrs. HORN. Etta Horn. I am from the District.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ETTA HORN, VICE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF WELFARE RIGHTS GROUPS

What we see in the food stamp program is too high—I am on welfare, and the food stamps are too high. By the time we buy food stamps, we do not have enough money left to pay rent and buy children's clothes. For instance, I have a daughter in senior high. When I get finished paying for her, paying for something for her to wear to school and the other kids to wear to school, and then buy food stamps and pay rent, we just do not have anything left.

I was one of the coordinators who went down to the Agriculture Department and spoke about this, and I was told that they did not care about whether our children went to school or had clothes on, just as long as they had full stomachs. And I think this was kind of a bad attitude.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much. That is a good observation.

Did you have something?

STATEMENT OF TIM SAMPSON, STAFF ASSOCIATE, POVERTY/RIGHTS ACTION CENTER

Mr. SAMPSON. Yes. My name is Tim Sampson. I am a staff associate with the Poverty/Rights Action Center which serves as a national headquarters for the welfare rights movement, a federation of 200 welfare recipients organizations in more than 70 communities across the country. And we are hopeful that the food stamp program not only will continue, but will address itself to some of the serious problems in its functioning which have been identified by recipients.

This morning testimony was given from farm groups and from public welfare people indicating that the program is working very well, and I think that there is some serious mistake here and some serious problems, and that people have not been hearing the voice of the welfare recipients who are deeply concerned about this program.

New York was mentioned; just this week in New York 400 people representing welfare recipients, organized welfare recipients, in the city of New York demonstrated before the department of public welfare to demand that that department not institute the food stamp program because they were convinced that despite some of the benefits of the program its difficulties and its harassments to them as people, would not make it a good program for them. And I think that this is serious indictment of the way that the program has operated because New York recipients are speaking to one of the problems.

I would just, without taking too much of the committee's time, Mr. Chairman, would like to mention very briefly a couple of the key problems.

The major problem, as Mrs. Hamer has said, in Mississippi and elsewhere and has been recognized by other people speaking before the committee this morning, the major problem has been that there are people who can't afford to commit that portion of their income which the Department of Agriculture guidelines require in order to obtain food stamps. It is either too much money for them to commit or in the case of many, many poor people in the South and in urban America in the North they do not have any part of their income that they can—they do not have the income or any cash that they can commit to the purchase of food stamps. This is a serious problem. We believe some adjustment in the program must be made for it, either some provision for giving free stamps to such people or drastically lowering these guideline amounts.

The Department of Agriculture, as Mrs. Horn mentioned, when Members of the National Coordinating Committee of Welfare Rights Groups met with them recently, was not at all interested in hearing any of the complaints that we recipients had about the program nor in any negotiations or discussions about how some of the regulations might be shifted to provide a better program for recipients as they experience it.

For example, one way that this program could be much more responsive to recipients' needs would be to provide a range for the amount that the recipient has to spend. Now, that is a fixed amount. The Department of Agriculture determines in any area how much a person should spend for food. They must commit that portion of their income in order to receive this bonus. We would urge that that at least be a very flexible amount.

Second, recipients who are kept off of this program—because they have irregular purchases of stamps, are denied getting back on it—have no appeal as the regulations are now set up. We believe this is contrary to the spirit of our welfare programs as reflected in the Social Security Act requirements that recipients be allowed a right to a fair hearing, to appeal from any administrative ruling.

There are several pages of spelled out procedures for store owners to file when they have been denied participation in the program. They have a set procedure, a whole elaborate process whereby their rights to participate in a program to receive the stamps from recipients are safeguarded. Recipients have no such rights in the present program. And these are but a few of the ways in which there could be—in which recipients voices across the country, people who are receiving food stamps—I would like for Mrs. Horn to show you all what a food stamp coupon looks like. I'll bet most of the people here have not had the experience of seeing a food stamp coupon—and I think that this is my way, if you will, and our way, as representatives of recipients telling you—you might pass it around——

Senator JORDAN. I know what it looks like.

Mr. SAMPSON (continuing). Telling you that recipients on the receiving end of these programs have something valuable to contribute in terms of letting you know how these programs are functioning. And their voices must be heard and listened to, and some of the reforms they urge must be incorporated in this law; otherwise, it will be in fact, a law for the farmers. The Department of Agriculture on several occasions has told representatives of recipient organizations that this is not a welfare program. This is a food program. If you want a welfare program, go over to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Now, the response that the recipients have made to that is that it is a welfare program. The Department of Agriculture has made it very clear whose welfare it is for. This is a welfare program for the farmers. It is not for poor people because their voices, their concerns, their needs have not been incorporated. And as people like Mrs. Horn, Mrs. Hamer, many others who represent welfare recipients, are here and available to speak, we would hope that some of their concerns are entered into this record, and, in fact, entered into the process of changing this law so that the basic principle that other people have spoken to, that no one go hungry in America, can be followed.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. SAMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JORDAN. We appreciate those comments that you added, and I can assure you that the full committee will take into consideration all the comments that have been made this morning.

If anybody has a statement to make that was not here this morning, we will give them 1 week to present that, and it will be incorporated in the record—that is, a written statement. There will not be any futher hearings on this, though, open hearings.

Mrs. Winifred G. Thompson, Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, did send a statement up. That will be put in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows):

STATEMENT OF WINIFRED G. THOMPSON, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The D.C. Food Stamp Program is a program administered by the D.C. Department of Public Welfare. We aet as a State agency under an agreement between the Distriet Commissioners and the U.S. Department of Agrieulture. S. 953, of eourse, is a proposal for funding a *Federal* program, and we are only a remote benefieiary of it. However, we think it proper to offer testimony on it. Local program operation is, ultimately, the test of the virtue of the proposed legislation.

We also feel that we have a responsibility to this Committee. Our program is nearest geographically. Low-ineome families within sight of the Capitol partieipate in the Food Stamp Program and they, and the eommunity, profit from the relationship.

Over thirty per eent of our families who buy and use Food Stamps do *not* reeeive Publie Assistanee payments. This number is steadily growing and this is good for the basie premise of this legislation is radieally different from the eommonly held philosophies of public welfare.

Partieipating families make their own decisions to join or not to join the program, then use their own funds to finanee purchase of Food Coupons. In the District of Columbia, Food Stamps are not sold by the Department of Public Welfare, but are sold aeross the eounter by tellers of participating eommereial banks under eontract with us.

Users of Food Stamps select the retail stores where they spend Food Coupons from among 442 approved retail food stores, who are not only willing to eooperate, but who have found it profitable indeed in terms of the increased purehasing power made available to otherwise severely limited food buyers. We feel now that merehandising praetiees have been affeeted to the extent that groeers who, in the past, found it eommereially unfeasible to offer variety foods in poverty areas now do so in antieipation of reasonable inventory turnover. The result is that needy families are able to provide their ehildren with that necessary variety in diet which is essential to adequate nutritional levels.

The Food Stamp Program does not "give" something in the sense that cash grants for Public Assistance "give". Rather, the Food Stamp Program provides opportunity for needy families to obtain minimum food requirements for their families *with what they have*, no matter how small their ineome may be. The benefits provided are not exeessive and at the very low ineome levels they may seem quite small, but this partieular feature reinforees the essentially American notion that families prefer to make do with what they have rather than seek the charity of their neighbors.

Every Food Stamp family must eontribute *to the extent of its ability* before reeeiving any benefit whatever! We affirm this as good business for the eountry over and above the benefit to the economy so graphically expressed by Senator Robert C. Byrd at the time when he introduced the bill whieh is now being considered.

The Food Stamp Program is not "welfare" in the sense that the term is usually used. However, the use of Food Stamps does have an effeet on households which do reeeive Public Assistanee payments through our ageney. It is a truism that many families who reeeive Publie Assistanee have household management problems, and this despite the best efforts of easeworkers who are in contact with them.

Food Stamp workers tell us that management in these households is improving, that purehase of Food Stamps, whieh represent the month's food budget, induces these households to make reasonable alloeations of stamps for periodie food purchasing, with reservations for "speeial" shopping and bulk staple purehases. Sinee we are not now deeply involved in aggressive eonsumer edueation projeets, we ean make no hard assessment of the extent of this improvement in household management praetiee, but we do feel that there has been such improvement and that the Food Stamp Program has made its contribution to it.

Prior to our partieipation in the Food Stamp Program, the D.C. Department of Publie Welfare distributed eommodities under the Donated Foods Program. Our partieipants feel that Food Stamps are far superior. They appreciate the opportunity for variety buying and the relative independenee and dignity offered by the Food Stamp Program. We have the aggressive support of public health agencies who help us to inform needy families and also to assist those families in wisest use of stamps in improving diet. Adequate diet is neeessary to full life and vigor, to effective performance by wage-earners, and to response to edueation by

the children of needy families. Cooperating agencies include private health and community service organizations as well as the D.C. Department of Public Health. We are united in an effort to inform the needy of this new approach to helping people help themselves.

A particular area of concern has been meeting the need of Social Security pensioners whose retirement payments are grossly inadequate to provide the diet necessary to health and well-being, but who enjoy the feeling of independence derived from use of Food Stamps rather than direct welfare-type supplementation. Despite inherent difficulties in reaching this group with information, their participation is growing.

To demonstrate the need for continued effort in the specific problem area of participation by senior citizens, we surveyed a segment of people known to our agency through another program. The group we consider here are persons approved during the months of February and March of this year for aid as aged medical indigents under the Kerr-Mills program. We emphasize that these people are not in receipt of Public Assistance payments. They *have* income, but such low income, as verified by our agency, that they require some assistance with medical necessities. In short, they are old, ailing, and poor, and may be expected to require even better diet than some of the rest of us.

After excluding all persons other than those residing in households—that is, institutional cases and the like—we found that of the remainder fewer than seven per cent now participate in the Food Stamp Program.

Our program is small—something in excess of 6,000 participating households involving a few less than 25,000 persons. We attribute this to two basic reasons. The first is the difficulty in providing information about the program and its benefits to people who are somewhat removed from the mainstream of society by their poverty. The second is that the Food Stamp Program extends benefits to only those who are willing to contribute their own best effort to help themselves. Only after expending their own cash to the limit of their ability to do so, do they receive "bonus" stamps. This may restrict participation to a degree, but it assures maximum beneficial use of program funds. These families *want* to do better than they *can* and are willing to *try!*

The D.C. Department of Public Welfare is committed to promoting maximum use of this program within the limits of the eligibility requirements imposed by the Food Stamp Act as implemented by our regulations and those of the Department of Agriculture. The law wisely provided effective controls for prevention of abuses. We have found them enforceable with no undue hardship to our participants and with no excessive expense to the agency.

We strongly urge favorable action by the Committee and make no recommendations for essential changes.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you. That will conclude this hearing.

I want to thank every one of you for being here, those who participated, and those who came to learn what goes on in a hearing. And I hope you profited by the hearing.

Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

(Additional statements filed for the record are as follows:)

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
April 28, 1967.

Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have received a number of messages from Alabama concerning H.R. 1318, the Food Stamp Authorization Bill of 1967, all of them strongly opposing that section of the bill which would assess 20 percent of the cost of the Food Stamp program to the various States.

As these correspondents point out, the inclusion of this section will make it impossible for most States to participate in the program, since they would be unable to take on this additional burden.

I invite your attention to the comments of Governor Wallace and those of Ruben K. King, Commissioner of Pensions and Security for the State of Alabama. I also enclose letters which have come to me from food distributors and processors.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JOHN SPARKMAN.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
Montgomery, Ala., April 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: Both as Governor of Alabama and Chairman of the State Board of Pensions and Security, I am writing to express my concern about H.R. 1318, the Food Stamp Authorization Bill of 1967. Mr. King has shared with me his communications to you and all other members of the Alabama Congressional Delegation regarding this bill. I am writing to say that I wholeheartedly concur in his analysis of the situation.

Both the Surplus Food Program and the Food Stamp Program are of great benefit to needy Alabamians in the counties in which they operate. We have been concerned that all counties have not taken advantage of one or the other of these programs. This is partially because of the fact that the Department of Pensions and Security does not have enough State funds to defray the entire cost of the Commodity Distribution and Food Stamp Programs. Instead, it has to be sold to the counties with a request that they participate in the cost. We have been pleased that additional counties are participating, and others are considering entering the program. If H.R. 1318 were enacted, it is my considered judgment that the Food Stamp Program could no longer operate in any counties in Alabama.

For this reason I respectfully urge you to use your influence in seeing that H.R. 1318 is not enacted because it would be a real disservice to the needy people in Alabama. I am sending a similar letter to all members of the Alabama Congressional Delegation.

Sincerely yours,

LURLEEN B. WALLACE,
Governor.

MARCH 29, 1967.

Hon. BILL NICHOLS
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NICHOLS: Thank you very much for your letter of March 23, 1967, informing me about the action of the Committee on Agriculture which proposed to have the States bear 20% of the cost of the free food stamps issued to recipients.

Last year in Jefferson and Walker Counties we distributed $1,463,690.00 in free food stamps to recipients. You can readily see that 20% of this figure would be $292,738.00 if we had to bear that portion of the cost. We opened the Greene County Food Stamp Program in January, and have just this month opened in Lamar and Dallas Counties. We do not have figures on these counties but it would be reasonable to assume that by including these the current amount could very easily be in the neighborhood of $400,000.00. We have opened the program and will begin selling stamps in Bullock County probably the first of June which will add to this figure.

Dealing with the overall situation we believe that we should take into account just what such a policy would do if we opened the program in all sixty-seven counties, and we believe that we should be prepared to treat all counties alike. Our experience to date leads us to believe that Walker County is a fair estimate of what we might expect to find in counties throughout the State. It would, of course, vary from county to county but we believe Walker County would give us a fair estimate. Last year we issued food stamps to 4,878 people. This was 9% of the population of Walker County. The 1960 census shows that Alabama had a population of 3,266,740 people. Nine percent of that figure would lead us to believe that if we were operating statewide we would serve 294,000 persons per month. The average value of free food stamps given per month is approximately $7.50, which means we would issue free stamps in one month valued at $2,205,000.00 or a total of $26,460,000.00 in one year. Again, applying the 20%

figure as a proposed participation for States, the cost to the State of Alabama in one year would amount to $5,292,000.00.

It is my considered opinion that such a move on the part of the Congress in this respect would defeat all of the good work that has been done since the program was first instituted. We feel that the program has been beneficial to eligible recipients in Alabama and has been a material boost to the economy where it has been operating as all of the free or bonus stamps respresent that much additional food purchasing power.

Departing from the above I should like to add that we have already experienced great difficulty in selling the program to county governments. This office directs and supervises the program, but the basic funds for operating the program are supplied by the county governments with the U.S. Department of Agriculture participating in the cost of administration to the tune of about one-third of the cost of personnel. In addition to that cost, the county has to supply office space and other local facilities. We have had several of the county governments approach us on getting state relief through the legislature in the cost of administration. We have not yet worked up anything on this subject, but we know that we will be pressed for some sort of action.

Again, looking at the Food Stamp Program in an overall manner I think I can say without fear of contradiction that the whole idea of States participating would cause mass withdrawal of participation in the program by the States and particularly Alabama.

I want to express my sincere appreciation to you for bringing this matter to my attention.

Cordially yours,

RUBEN K. KING,
Commissioner, Department of Pensions and Security, State of Alabama.

Birmingham, Ala., April 11, 1967.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
3213 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are informed that there is a bill before Congress that proposes to revamp the Federal Food Stamp Program, by requiring the states to participate up to 20% of the cost of the coupons issued to the needy. We are not too familiar with the status of this bill at the present time, but believe that it would have the effect of killing the Food Program so far as Alabama is concerned.

The Stamp Program is the most practical way to issue food to the needy, in giving them a balanced diet and at the same time, to distribute the commodities through the regular channels.

We trust that you will do what you can to kill this bill and continue the Stamp Program as it is now set up.

Thanking you for your consideration of this request, I am

Yours very truly,

CLARENCE M. PINSON,
Western Grain Co.

APRIL 10, 1967.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
3213 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have been advised that the Federal Food Stamp Program, which has been so successful in feeding the needy, is now before Congress with a bill which proposes to revamp this program by requiring participating states to pay for 20 percent of the bonus coupons issued to the recipients. It is our understanding that this amendment has passed the House Agriculture Committee and should be voted upon by the House in the near future.

This is a very unwise proposal and one that could not secure immediate funding by the State of Alabama. In urging previous support by the Alabama Congressional Delgation of the Food Stamp Program, we pointed out that this method built self respect among the needy and placed their purchases of food products in the regular channels of trade. If the states do not accept the bonus stamp proposal which would require them to raise a 20 percent matching fund, then the former program would again be activated. Under this plan, surplus commodity products were given to the needy without regard to the quantity of each product or to the family's ability to consume same. Much of it was fed to pigs and livestock. Some was wasted and others bartered for something the recipient desired. May we depend upon you to vote against the proposed amendment which would require the states to purchase bonus coupons in the amount of 20 percent of the face value.

As you perhaps know, the Alabama Food Council, which we represent, has as members all segments of the food industry—manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers and others. We are united in believing that the best method of improving the diet of the needy is through the coupon method.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON R. DURRETT,
Manager, Alabama Food Council, Alabama Merchants Association.

SALEM, OREG.,
April 24, 1967.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
417 Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: We were recently advised by Farris Bryant of the Office of Emergency Planning, that H.R. 1318, the Food Stamp Authorization Bill, has been amended by the House Committee on Agriculture to require, effective July 1, 1969, each participating state to contribute 20 per cent of the bonus value of the stamps. In view of our having observed the simultaneous operation of the Food Stamp Plan and the Abundant Foods Plan in Oregon, I feel it appropriate to advise you of our thinking on the proposed change.

The practical effect of the Food Stamp Plan, since its initiation in 1963, has been to decrease participation in Multnomah County. In November, 1962, the last full month of the Abundant Food Program, 25,025 persons (4.75 per cent of Multnomah County's population) participated. In November, 1966 under the Food Stamp Plan, 10,557 persons took advantage of the stamps. This accounted for 1.9 per cent of Multnomah County's population. Even more significant, however, is the massive decrease which has occurred in the number of non-Public Welfare recipients taking advantage of these programs. In 1962, over 50 per cent of the persons drawing Abundant Foods were non-Public Welfare Assistance recipients. A similar percentage was reflected in the rest of the state. By 1966, the proportion of non-public assistance recipients participating in all counties other than Multnomah County, had risen to 55.4 per cent. Under the Food Stamp Plan, however, the proportion of non-public assistance recipients had dropped to 16.4 per cent of the already reduced total number served. I am attaching a brief schedule which indicates the comparisons which can be drawn between 1962 and 1966.

One of the basic reasons for these results is the restrictiveness of the Food Stamp Plan coupled with the lack of clear guidelines on the part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. On several occasions the Department of Agriculture has refused to clearly lay out the rules and regualtions for operation and has asked for the best judgment of officils of the State of Oregon. After consideration, when specific proposals for modifying operating practices were forwarded to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, these have been denied.

The primary area of restrictive rulings is in the amount of the individual's budget that must be spent in order to qualify for the stamp program. A second area is the requirement of regularity of purchase, which means, as now interpreted, that if the individual misses purchasing more than two times in six months, he must go through the complete recertification process. This has resulted in certification costs approximately 60 per cent higher per capita in Multnomah County than in the rest of the State of Oregon. While Federal matching funds are available for certification costs of non-public assistance recipients, these only partially offset the additional costs.

In view of the above factors, while we feel the Food Stamp Plan could be of significant benefit, as it is now administered by the U.S.D.A., we would prefer that the program be withdrawn and replaced with the Abundant Foods Program, if we were required to bear a portion of the stamp costs. If, however, we were given the discretion necessary in terms of the amount of stamps required to be purchased, coupled with a significant relaxation or elimination of the restrictive provisions relating to regulation of purchase, we would be in a position to consider participation in the cost of the stamps.

I hope this information will be useful to you in your consideration of these amendments and the Food Stamp Program as they will be presented to you in the coming months. If we can provide you with any additional information on this subject, please let me know.

Sincerely,

TOM MCCALL, *Governor.*

Comparison of food stamp and abundant food programs

	November 1962 Abundant food	November 1966 Food stamps
Multnomah County		
PA	12,386	8,818
Non-PA	(50.5%) 12,639	(16.4%) 1,739
Total	25,025	10,557
All other counties		
	Abundant food	Abundant food
PA	14,990	19,766
Non-PA	(51.6%) 15,988	(55.4%) 24,557
Total	30,978	44,323

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 25, 1967.*

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: The American Farm Bureau Federation is opposed to the legislation to extend the Food Stamp Plan which is now before your Committee.

Farm Bureau policy on this issue is as follows:

"The government food stamp plan, started in 1961 on a pilot basis, has been expanded to include a number of additional areas. It has not increased food consumption significantly. Instead it has transferred a part of the total cost of food for relief distribution to the federal government. While we recognize that there are some people in this country who need diets with higher nutritional standards, we do not believe that it is the responsibility of the federal government to distribute free food to improve dietary standards through a government food stamp plan. We are opposed to any food stamp plan."

We would appreciate this letter being made a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director, American Farm Bureau Federation.

APRIL 15, 1967.

SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture Research
and General Legislation, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The National Farmers Organization strongly supports and urges the passage of Bill S953 to extend the Food Stamp Act. We oppose the State sharing provision that was included in the House committee report. The food stamp plan should play an ever increasing role in overcoming the financial limitations to better diets on the part of our low income families. We request that this statement be included in the Record.

HARVEY SICKELS,
Secretary, National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.

WASHINGTON D.C., APRIL 25, 1967.

Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Research and General Legislation,
Agriculture and Forestry Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JORDAN: The Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, consisting of 60 affiliated trade unions, with 6½ million members, strongly supports the Food Stamp program.

When the Food Stamp Act became law in 1964, it marked the first victory in this nation's war on poverty. It established public policy that fully recognized

that a nutritionally adequate diet is a prerequisite for breaking the poverty cycle among the poor.

We urge the permanent extension of the Food Stamp program. We firmly oppose any amendments which would reduce its scope. We strongly oppose any amendments that would require local or state governments to pay matching grants, or otherwise finance this program. We also oppose any amendments that would reduce the federal authorization.

We believe that the Food Stamp program is intrinsically superior to the direct food program. It utilizes normal channels of distribution with resulting economies. It is more convenient for the needy. It provides the poor a much greater range of foods—essentials such as meats, vegetables, fruit and milk—with resulting improvements in nutrition. Any increased imposition of costs on local governments will inevitably result in a decrease in participation and without even the assurance that counties discontinuing food stamps will institute the inferior direct distribution program.

Our support for the Food Stamp program is also in keeping with the IUD's record, and the labor movement's as a whole, of support for measures designed to support farm prices and farm incomes, and the record over the years will demonstrate this support. We have not taken a narrow parochial view of rural problems although we have few members there. We have insisted year in and out that the problems of rural people are problems for urban people and for organized workers. We do not believe that prosperity and the good life can be obtained by urban people unless they can be shared by rural people.

As we have supported agricultural production control legislation, we have also supported the use of our agricultural abundance for supporting free governments abroad and reducing poverty here at home. We have always supported the school lunch program, the milk program, the direct food distribution program and the food stamp program—all on the grounds that these programs contribute to higher farm incomes while at the same time improving the health and living standards of the American people.

We are frank to say that improvements in the present program should be made. But such improvements can only be achieved if federal moneys are *not* cut and if local and state governments are *not* required to provide additional financial support. Obviously, one of our prime concerns is the lack of adequate food for the poor.

Neither the direct food distribution program nor the food stamp program has reached many of the poorest counties in the nation, apparently because local governments largely have been unable or unwilling to take advantage of the programs. How many of the non-participating local units have failed to establish these programs because of the current costs of supporting them we do not know, but it appears obvious that cost is and has been an important factor in denying to many of our poorest citizens access to the minimum necessities of life. In Mississippi, for example, the operation of such programs was at a minimum until the Office of Economic Opportunity provided funds to subsidize local costs of administration.

Even under existing authority and financing arrangements, we are informed that less than 2 percent of the poor in South Carolina and Virginia have access to any food distribution program. In Alabama less than 12 percent of those in poverty have such access. In view of the impact which continuing mechanization and the new cotton program are having on small farmers, sharecroppers and farm workers in the South, the need for the kind of assistance provided by these programs is increasing, not decreasing. In all humanity we urge that this is no time to attempt to shift an additional financial burden onto these areas; the result will inevitably be curtailments of existing operations, and a postponement of the day when other counties can be added. Were it to happen, there would be an increase in the numbers of people suffering from malnutrition rather than a diminution. Studies indicate that there are serious deficiencies in the existing food programs.

Large numbers of desperately poor people receive no food from any federal program, since many of the poorest counties are without any program. In the shift from direct distribution to food stamps there is in many areas a sharp drop in the number of families participating, due in part to the mechanics of recertification, and in part to other factors, including the difficulty with which people living on low and frequently intermittent or seasonal incomes adjust to fixed monthly payments. Moreover, even with the small payments presently required by the Department of Agriculture, some families simply do not have even those small

amounts and must endure without even the amount of aid they enjoyed from direct distribution.

The IUD has already recommended to Secretary Freeman to direct federal distribution where local governments refuse to allow their poor to take advantage of these programs. We have urged the Secretary to make stamps available free to families without income, and to smooth over the transition from direct distribution to food stamps more carefully to reduce the adverse impact demonstrated in the past.

But these suggested improvements of the existing program only demonstrate our concern for continuing the Food Stamp program.

We would appreciate inclusion of this letter as part of the hearing record. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JACK T. CONWAY,
Executive Director, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.

○

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 90-91
S. 953

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of S. 953 1
Digest of Public Law 90-91 2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 953

Jan. 10, 1967	Rep. Sullivan introduced H. R. 1318 which was referred to House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Feb. 9, 1967	Sen. Byrd, W. Va., introduced and discussed S. 953 which was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill and remarks of Sen. Byrd.
Mar. 20, 1967	House committee voted to report H. R. 1318.
Apr. 12, 1967	House committee reported H. R. 1318 with amendments. H. Report 189. Print of bill and report.
Apr. 14, 1967	Summary of H. R. 1318 as reported by House committee.
May 10, 1967	House Rules Committee granted an open rule for consideration of H. R. 1318.
May 11, 1967	House Rules Committee reported resolution for consideration of H. R. 1318. H. Res. 471, H. Report 257.
May 15, 1967	House began debate on H. R. 1318.
May 24, 1967	Senate committee reported S. 953 with amendment. S. Report 289. Print of bill and report.
May 31, 1967	Senate passed S. 953 as reported.
June 8, 1967	House passed S. 953 with amendments (in lieu of H. R. 1318). H. R. 1318 tabled due to passage of S. 953.
June 12, 1967	Senate conferees were appointed on S. 953.
June 16, 1967	House conferees were appointed on S. 953.
Sept. 19, 1967	Senate agreed to House amendment in nature of substitute. House concurred in Senate amendment.
Sept. 27, 1967	Approved: Public Law 90-91. Statement by President when signing bill.

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1318

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year" and substituting therefor "and for each subsequent fiscal year such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1318

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN

JANUARY 10, 1967

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

Administration on Aging—Research and development grants, Jan. 1–Dec. 31, 1966—Continued

DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS—Continued

	Organization	Project	Amount
ROLES FOR THE AGING			
Arkansas, Little Rock: AA-4-67-032-01	Arkansas Farmers Union	Community activities for senior Arkansans (CASA)	$74,995
Illinois, Winnetka: AA-4-67-031-01	Board of Education, Winnetka publicschools	Project for academic motivation	18,085
New York, New York: AA-4-67-035-01	Community Service Society	Older volunteers in community service	36,770
Ohio, Martins Ferry: AA-4-67-034-01	City of Martins Ferry	Elderly services and industries program	45,985
Oregon, Portland: AA-4-66-006	Lewis and Clark College	Replacement supervisors in Portland public schools	49,500
Vermont, Newport: AA-4-67-033-01	Orleans County Council of Social Agencies	Use of older persons as local library aids	25,808
SENIOR CENTERS			
Illinois, Chicago: AA-4-66-018	YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago	Senior citizen's mobile service project	66,718
Minnesota, Rochester: AA-4-66-020	Senior Citizens Services, Inc.	A multipurpose senior citizens' service in a historical setting.	19,820
Nebraska, Omaha: AA-4-66-015	Parks, Recreation, and Public Properties Department.	Recreational and cultural service for senior citizens	51,405
New York, Long Island: AA-4-66-009	Health and Welfare Council of Nassau County, Garden City.	Senior Centers of Nassau County, Inc	47,588
Ohio, Cincinnati: AA-4-66-017	YWCA	Senior services	89,647
Rhode Island, Providence: AA-4-66-002	City of Providence	Providence Multipurpose center	79,810
RESEARCH PROJECTS			
California, San Francisco: AA-4-66-005	Northern California Presbyterian Homes, Inc.	Evaluation, large city elderly service program	$8,810
California, Los Angeles: AA-4-66-011	Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO.	Los Angeles labor retiree research project	26,052
Florida, Tallahassee: AA-4-67-036-01	Florida Commission on Aging and Florida State University.	Retirement hotels: Function, service, and relations	42,780
Illinois, Chicago: AA-4-67-030-01	Roosevelt University	Widowhood: Changes in role and role clusters	17,549
Louisiana, Baton Rouge: AA-4-66-022	Louisiana State University	Adjustment to confrontation by aging in 3 cultures	20,130
Massachusetts, Boston: AA-4-66-024	Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston.	Community services for aging	36,719
New York, Ithaca: AA-4-66-010	New York State College of Agriculture	Community structure and aging	37,766
Ohio, Oxford: AA-4-66-012	Miami University	Women in retirement	25,573
Pennsylvania, Harrisburg: AA-4-67-027-01	Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare	Needs and use of services among Negro and white aged	49,287
Washington, Tacoma: AA-4-66-008	Pacific Lutheran University	Subsidized housing and the adjustment of older women	3,520
Wisconsin, Madison: AA-4-66-013	University of Wisconsin	A study of the aged with special reference to adjustment in retirement communities.	46,800
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS			
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia	National Analysts, Inc.	Study of susceptibility to health frauds and misrepresentation (interagency contract of which Administration on Aging's is).	$31,250

[1] These were funded as research grants but contain major demonstration-development emphasis.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF AN EFFECTIVE ELECTRONIC GUIDANCE SYSTEM FOR USE IN NAVIGATION CHANNELS SERVING U.S. PORTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy to introduce today, on behalf of myself and Senators WILLIAMS of New Jersey, CASE, SCOTT, and BOGGS, a bill to provide for research and development of an effective electronic guidance system for use in navigation channels serving U.S. ports. A similar bill has been introduced in the House by Representative JAMES BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

The project is to be conducted by the Coast Guard and will determine the feasibility and applications of new navigation aids which could improve the safety of ships entering and leaving ports under hazardous conditions.

The need for new and more accurate navigation devices is great. In the Delaware Channel, for example, in the 15-year period from 1951 through 1965, according to U.S. Coast Guard records, there were a total of 343 collisions and 335 groundings, resulting in property damage of more than $25 million and the loss of 43 lives.

Recently the Delaware River Pilots' Association and the Joint Executive Committee for Development of the Philadelphia Port Area have pioneered the establishment of a bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone procedure to assist ships in navigating the channel.

It would be our hope that the test will lead to the development of a device which would give a ship's navigator precise information on the position of his ship in the channel. Such a system could operate in conjunction with the ship's radar and the bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone. It would, if successful, further reduce the accident rate and cut delays caused by bad visibility.

The Delaware River is believed to be a highly suitable location for conducting this research project, and all port groups and agencies in the area are willing to cooperate wholeheartedly.

The bill authorizes the appropriation of $100,000 for the project, and specifies that the results will be reported back to Congress within 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 952) to authorize the conduct of certain research and development through the Coast Guard in order to develop an effective electronic guidance system introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce a bill today which will amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to that ending on June 30, 1967.

I cannot speak too highly of the value of this program, both for the people who have benefited from it directly by receiving the bonus buying power and for the communities in which it has been operated. I, myself, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture have received numerous letters stating the visual evidence of good which result from added food provided for needy families. School principals and teachers have written that children receiving extra food at home under this program "are visually more alert and do better work."

West Virginia inaugurated this program as a pilot study in December 1961 and it since has spread to 590 counties in 41 States. It is estimated that some 1.3 million people share in the benefits of the food stamps.

With the extension of the program into the future, the U.S. Department of Agriculture believes it can reach out to a total of 2 million persons who need this assistance.

Since the first stamps were issued in West Virginia in 1961, there has been a total Federal expenditure through December 31, 1966, of $202,808,734 for the program. This expenditure represents the bonus buying power to receive this assistance, the families receiving stamps had to spend another $342,574,529 of their own money—bringing total expenditures for food to $545,383,263.

It has also been known that food stamps have an accelerating business effect, and it is a beneficial one, on the communities where they were are issued.

One estimate of the effect has been that for each additional $1 spent for food, the community realizes another $7 in economic activities due to the chain-reaction of more purchases and more employment.

We can take extreme pleasure in knowing that this program appears to be expertly and excellently administered, both by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and by the States where it is operating.

I wish to extend my congratulations for this fine record to Miss Isabelle Kelley, director of the Food Stamp Division.

In my State of West Virginia, Commissioner L. L. Vincent of the department of welfare and Mrs. Grace Strain, director of food stamps, also deserve great credit for the efficient operation of the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, introduced by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) to establish a National Commission on Product Safety, and it was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 87

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 88

Mr. BYRD of Virginia submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 355, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18 OF UNITED STATES CODE

AMENDMENT NO. 90

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of the administration, I submit, for appropriate reference an amendment to the bill (S. 1) to amend title 18 of the United States Code. I offer this amendment, Mr. President, as a substitute for S. 1, which I introduced in the opening days of this session of Congress. The major provisions of this amendment are identical with those contained in that legislation, which was introduced earlier in the session, and, indeed, as I have read it over—and I have read it carefully—identical with the bill introduced in March of 1965.

In submitting this amendment, I speak with a sense of urgency for the gun problem in this country becomes more serious with each passing day. The tragic loss of life by gun in murders, suicides, and "accidental deaths" continues to spiral upward with no end in sight.

I speak with a sense of expectation for I believe that gun legislation can be enacted this year. The facts are before the Congress and our responsibility to act is clear. There is a virtual mandate from the people to act, if we are to place any credence in our public opinion polls which have consistently proven over the years that the overwhelming majority of Americans favor strong gun controls.

I speak with a sense of hope that the wanton and reckless taking of human life can be stemmed.

And, I speak with a sense of conviction that effective Federal gun legislation is the key to the realization of this goal.

The amendment I am submitting today represents the combined efforts of the Justice Department and the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in our study of the gun problem over the last 6 years.

This amendment is not predicated on an emotional reaction to any one incident. It is based on 6 years of information gathering on the gun problem which conclusively documents the need for a strong Federal firearms law.

Basically this bill is designed to aid the States by placing uniform restrictions over the interstate traffic in firearms, so that the States can effectively deal with the gun problem within their own borders.

The bill provides needed controls in six major areas: mail order sales, over-the-counter sales, sales to minors, licensing, imports, and destructive devices.

It provides:

First. For a prohibition on the interstate mail order sale of handguns, rifles and shotguns to individuals.

Second. For a prohibition on the over-the-counter sale of handguns to nonresidents of a given State.

Third. For the identification and determination of the age of all purchasers of firearms from federally licensed dealers. In the case of handguns the age requirement is 21 years and in the case of rifles and shotguns, 18 years of age.

Fourth. For the licensing of all dealers, importers and manufacturers in firearms.

Fifth. For a prohibition on the importation of all military surplus handguns and for the regulation of all other imported firearms.

Sixth. For the stringent control over the destructive devices, antitank guns, bazookas, mortars, and so forth.

Mr. President, our course of action should be clear: the immediate consideration and passage of this bill.

The problem has been abundantly documented by investigations and public hearings.

There is no need for further hearings.

The effect of such hearings would only prove what I feel has been proven beyond question, and that is the need for the enactment of this bill.

The timeworn myths of the gun lobby have been laid to rest.

The emotional harangue which they have raised in past years has been countered with facts.

Their arguments against gun controls are groundless.

The most unconscionable argument they put forth is that we have not documented the existence of a gun problem.

I wonder just how many more murders, how many more robberies, and how many more assaults with guns have to be perpetrated in order that the gun lobbies acknowledge a serious gun problem and the need for immediate action by the Federal Government.

If the 5,600 murders, 45,000 armed robberies, and 34,700 aggravated assaults with guns in 1965 cannot convince them of the need for gun controls, I do not think anything will.

I think it is time the Congress looks at these facts and overlooks the blandishments of the gunrunners.

And if the facts of firearms abuse in 1965 are not enough to move us to action, let us examine the shocking picture in the first 9 months of 1966 regarding guns and their misuse in crime.

Fifty-nine percent of all murders were committed with guns.

This is the highest percentage in recorded history.

Aggravated assaults with a gun rose an appalling 22 percent.

Armed robbery, which comprises 58 percent of all robberies, rose a substantial 10 percent.

I believe that it is a national disgrace to allow this toll of life, limb, and property to go on unchecked.

It is deplorable in view of the facts that are before us and have been before us for a number of years that new Federal legislation has not been enacted. Certainly the gun lobby must share responsibility for this inaction for they have vehemently resisted even the most mild attempts to control firearms.

I would remind my colleagues in the Senate that immediately after I introduced S. 1592, in the 89th Congress, a concerted campaign to kill the bill was put into motion. An alleged analysis of that bill was prepared by the National Rifle Association and sent to its 750,000 members and affiliated clubs.

That document contained distortions, half truths, untruths, and presented a "doomsday" picture of the bill to the Nation's hunters and sportsmen. There was an immediate response to that letter by the membership of the NRA and Congress was deluged with letters of opposition to the bill.

However, when representatives of that organization were called to testify before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, they admitted in open hearings that false and misleading information was contained in that letter.

I asked the NRA to correct those misstatements and the false impressions that the letter gave to the thousands of sportsmen who read it. Yet to this date, they have not done so, in spite of their acknowledgement of error.

This, unfortunately, has been typical of the campaigns that have killed pro-

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 953

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 9 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 8), 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year" and substituting therefor "and for each subsequent fiscal year such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 953

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia

FEBRUARY 9 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 8), 1967
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued March 21, 1967
For actions of March 20, 1967
90th-1st: No. 44

CONTENTS

Accounting.....38
Advisory committee.....32
Agricultural exports....51
Appropriations.....7
Budget.....21,38
Budgeting.....2,38
Coffee agreement.....15
Census.....18
Child nutrition.....3
Committee assignments...10
Congressional reorganization.....4
Conservation.....26
Dairy imports.....15,30,45
Economy.....27
Electrification.....17
Exports.....51
Farm budget.....38
Farm loans.....5,35,48
Farm prices.....31
Farm program.....53
Feed grains.....15
Flood insurance.....55
Food for India.....1
Food for Pakistan.....25
Food for peace.....11
Food stamps.....3
Foreign aid.....1,11,25,36
Foreign affairs.....15
FHA loans.....5
Flammable fabrics.....50
Holidays.....9
Housing.....43
Human resources.....57
Inspection services.....6
Intergovernmental manpower.....2
Intergovernmental relations.....2,23
International affairs...46
Job Corps.....16,37
Latin America.....12
Marketing orders.....6
National debt.....34,40
National parks.....29
Older Americans.....54
Patents.....49
Personnel.....33,44
Planning.....2,22
Pollution.....52
Poverty.....24,35
Programming.....2
Public lands.....28
Public service.....41
Reclamation.....19,39
Recreation.....29,47
Research.....32
Rhodesia trade.....56
Rural federal aid.....36
See the U. S.....42
Selective service.....13
Taxation.....52
Tobacco.....20
User charges.....6
Veterans.....8
Wheat.....14

HIGHLIGHTS: See page 7

HOUSE

1. FOOD FOR INDIA. Agreed to the Senate amendment to H. J. Res. 267, to support emergency food assistance to India. This measure will now be sent to the President. See Digest No. 38 for provisions. p. H2919

2. ORGANIZATION; MANAGEMENT. Received the President's message on "The Quality of the American Government" (H. Doc. 90). In this message the President explained why he had recommended combination of the Commerce and Labor Departments, recommended the proposed Intergovernmental Manpower Act, and reported on

accomplishments in the fields of planning-programming-budgeting, cost reductions, and other aspects of management. pp. H2919-24

3. FOOD STAMPS; CHILD NUTRITION. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 1318 (amended), to amend the Food Stamp Act and the Child Nutrition Act. p. D193

4. CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION. The Daily Digest states that the Agriculture Committee "Adopted a committee resolution recommending to the House that legislative jurisdiction over agricultural colleges and experiment stations and agricultural education extension services continue to be vested in the committee." p. D193

5. FARM LOANS. Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to authorize additional Farmers Home Administration loans for recreational enterprises, to remove the ceiling on the annual aggregate of insured housing loans for a temporary period, etc.; to House Agriculture Committee and Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. pp. H3081, S4008

Rep. Teague, Tex., commended the new Farmers Home Administration water development loan program. p. H3026

Rep. Hamilton reported on water development loans made in his district, Ind. p. H3027

6. USER CHARGES. Received from this Department a proposed bill to place on a self-supporting basis the special benefit portion of cotton classing, tobacco inspection, grain inspection, warehouse inspection and licensing, and related services; to Agriculture Committee. p. H3081

Received from this Department a proposed bill to provide for payment by handler assessments of part of the administrative costs relating to marketing orders; to Agriculture Committee. p. H3081

7. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 7501, the Treasury-Post Office and Executive Office appropriation bill (H. Rept. 144). p. H3082

8. VETERANS. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 16 (in lieu of H. R. 2068) to increase pensions to certain veterans and their widows, and to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans for service after Jan. 31, 1955. pp. H2928-51

9. HOLIDAYS. Passed, 313-35, under suspension of the rules H. R. 2513, to establish a Commission on National Observances and Holidays (composed of the Archivist, Librarian of Congress, and Smithsonian Secretary) to consider and make recommendations to the President on proposals for special observances and holidays. pp. H2955-60

10. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Chairman Patman announced subcommittee memberships of the Banking and Currency Committee. pp. H2963-4

11. FOOD FOR PEACE. Rep. Findley inserted an article, "Food for Peace or Food for War?" pp. H2969-70

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued April 13, 1967
For actions of April 12, 1967
90th-1st; No. 54

CONTENTS

Agriculture economy.....5
Agricultural exports....41
Animal drugs.....38
Animal research.....44
Appalachia.....43
Buildings.....33
Census.....26
Civil rights.....42
Community action.....8
Conservation.....25
Contracts.....33
Credit unions.....24
Dairy imports.....11,29
Education.....30
Electrification.....37
Employment.....19
Farm labor.....10
Federal aid.....42
Feed grain.....35
Flood control.....14
Flood insurance.....39
Food stamps.....1,28
Food supply.....17
Forestry.....12
Grants-in-aid.....32
Holiday.....40
Information.....6
Intergovernmental relations.....9
Leave.....31
Life insurance.....31
Marketing.....20,27
Metal scrap.....2
Natural resources.....7
Personnel.....19,21,31
Poverty.....22,46
Reclamation.....18
Research.....3,4,44,45
Saline water.....4
Taxation.....13,23,32
Textile imports.....15
Tobacco.....20
Water resources.....16
Wheat.....35
Wild rivers.....34
Wildlife.....36

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported food stamp bill.

HOUSE

1. FOOD STAMP. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendments H. R. 1318, to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967 (H. Rept. 189). p. H4055

2. METAL SCRAP. Passed without amendment H. R. 5615, to continue until the close of June 30, 1969, the temporary suspension of duties on certain metal waste and scrap, principally iron and steel, aluminum, magnesium, nickel, and nickel

alloys, and to extend from June 30, 1968, to June 30, 1969, the present tariff exemption on copper waste and scrap and copper articles to be used in remanufacture by melting. p. H3976

3. RESEARCH. Passed, 391-22, without amendment H. R. 5404, to expand the functions of the National Science Foundation to include support for applied (as well as basic) research, analysis and interpretation (as well as collection and collation)of data on national scientific and technical resources, obtaining central information on funds provided to particular institutions by various Federal agencies, support of scientific activities relating to international cooperation and foreign policy when so requested by the State Department, support for social (as well as physical) sciences, and strengthening the organization and management authorities of the Director of the Foundation. pp. H3976-91

4. WATER CONVERSION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6133, amended, to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program and to expand the program. p. D257

5. AGRICULTURE ECONOMY. Rep. Kleppe expressed concern over the number of auction sales of farms in N. Dak. and Minn. and stated that the decisions of farm families to get out of agriculture seemingly are "prompted by economic factors." p. H4001

Rep. Berry expressed concern over the "future of agriculture...and food production generally." pp. H4004-5

6. INFORMATION. Rep. Snyder criticized the administration's "publicity" spending mentioning this Department's expenditure. pp. H4002-3

7. NATURAL RESOURCES. Rep. Saylor commended and inserted an article, "Some Thoughts on Three Resources: Land, Air, and Water--How Do We Explain?" pp. H4012-14

8. COMMUNITY ACTION. Rep. William D. Ford spoke in support of the community action program as an aid to the poverty effort. pp. H4046-7

9. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Rep. Fountain inserted the status report on the recommendations to the Federal Government of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. pp. H4050-2

SENATE

10. FARM LABOR. Sen. McClellan spoke in opposition to the extension of minimum wage coverage to farmworkers and stated "the inclusion of certain agriculture workers has had a crippling effect on the economy of areas which are primarily dependent on agriculture." pp. S4920-1

Sen. Murphy discussed farm labor in Calif. and stated, "it is clear the Council of Calif. Growers does expect that there will be another critical farm labor shortage in my state this year and that foreign laborers will be needed." p. S4927

Sen. Williams, N.J., urged the extension of collective bargaining laws to cover farmworkers. p. S4944

11. DAIRY IMPORTS. Sen. Hartke spoke in favor of S. 612, to limit dairy imports, and inserted an article in support of his position. pp. S4946-7

90TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 189

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

APRIL 12, 1967.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. POAGE, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS AND MINORITY REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 1318]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1318) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out lines 5 through 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> the word "and" the first time it appears therein and by inserting after the word "1967;" the words "not in excess of $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968;"

Page 1, add at the end thereof the following:

> SEC. 2. Section 15 of the Food Stamp Act is amended by adding the following subsection:
>
> "(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each State shall be responsible for financing, from funds available to the State or political subdivision thereof, 20 per centum of the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments. Each State shall transfer such sums to, and they shall be made a part of, the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. Each State shall transfer such sums to such account within one calendar month following the calendar month in which the coupon

65-006—67——1

allotments are issued to eligible households. The provisions of this subsection shall not be effective for any coupon allotments issued prior to July 1, 1969, to enable each State to take such action as is necessary under the statutes of the State to comply with the provisions of this subsection."

And amend the title of the bill so as to read as follows:

A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

STATEMENT

H.R. 1318 extends the Food Stamp Program for 1 year, authorizing an appropriation of $195 million—the amount requested by the administration—for its operation from June 30, 1967 to July 1, 1968, and it anticipates other extensions in future years of this response of the Federal Government to the food sufficiency of needy persons.

However, the bill provides that beginning July 1, 1969, each participating State or political subdivision thereof will pay 20 percent of the cost of free (bonus) stamps distributed to eligible households. The States now share in part of their own supervisory costs of this program.

ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION

The administration had recommended, in H.R. 1318 as originally introduced, that the Congress permanently extend the Food Stamp Program and remove any legislative ceiling on annual appropriations for its operation.

The Committee on Agriculture does not approve such unlimited extension, and revised the bill accordingly.

The committee feels that the nature of this program is such, especially in relation to numerous other welfare operations, that its general objectives and policies should be subject to periodic legislative review, adjustment and refinement, and that the Congress should not limit its function henceforward merely to providing money for the program's rapid expansion.

A study by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress shows that as of January 1, 1966, there were more than 400 separate authorizations for various types of Federal assistance to State and local governments, these programs being administered by 21 departments and agencies and by numerous Federal bureaus and divisions. It is the position of this committee that the Congress would fail in its responsibility to the American people if it did not maintain surveillance over these programs it has authorized, through periodic review by the legislative committees in which the various authorizations originated.

Moreover, the committee is convinced that larger involvement of State and local responsibility, including a modest sharing of stamp costs, is essential to assure that the program will be operated in a sound and effective manner, to aid persons who qualify as deserving.

THE STAMP PROGRAM

The Food Stamp Act of 1964, an instrument in the war on poverty, established a national policy that, in order to promote the general welfare, the Nation's abundance of food shall be utilized cooperatively

by the States, the Federal Government, and local governmental unit to the maximum extent practicable to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's population and raise levels of nutrition among economically needy households.

The Congress established the Food Stamp Program also in the expectation that increased utilization of foods in maintaining adequate national levels of nutrition would tend to cause the distribution in a beneficial manner of our agricultural abundance and would strengthen the agricultural economy, as well as result in more orderly marketing and distribution of food.

In those areas of the country desiring to participate in the program, public assistance and other low-income households are certified by the local counterpart offices of the State welfare agency, using criteria developed by the State. Eligible families are required to pay about what they normally spend for food for stamps and, in return, receive stamps of greater value. The amount of the payment varies by household size and income. The State agencies also arrange for the sale of the stamps to participants—either through local offices or the State may contract with banks to perform this function for them.

Participants then use stamps at grocery stores just like cash, and may buy any food for human consumption except for identifiable imported items. The stamps may not be used to purchase tobacco or alcoholic beverages. Grocers redeem the stamps at their banks. The banks are reimbursed for the face value of the stamps through the Federal Reserve System.

DIRECT FOOD DISTRIBUTION

Food for the needy has been provided for many years through direct distribution of surplus commodities acquired through supply and price stabilization operation of farm programs. Foods supplied through such direct distribution have included, as available, flour, cornmeal, dry beans, canned meat, butter or margarine, grits, rolled wheat or rolled oats, cheese, dried eggs, lard or shortening, nonfat dry milk, peanut butter, dry split peas, raisins, and rice. This means of distributing food to the need still operates in 1,546 localities in 1,400 counties in 47 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and trust territories. Before the inauguration of the Food Stamp Program, such distribution was made in some 1,844 localities in 1,580 counties in 48 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and trust territories, Some 3.7 to 4 million persons now participate in this program, in which all the food is provided by the Federal Government, at a value this year of approximately $100 million.

FAR-REACHING POLICY CHANGE

Enactment of the food stamp law represented a far-reaching revision of Government policy on food.

The Food Stamp Program operates only in localities desiring to participate. It is designed to supplant the direct distribution of food, in areas electing to make the shift. Stamp purchases are not limited to surplus foods, such as the Government-owned commodities supplied under the direct distribution program.

Food stamps are available to relief recipients and to persons not on welfare rolls, where the income of households is deemed to be below

the requirements to supply sufficient nutritious food for the members of the households, after meeting other expenses.

The Food Stamp Program benefits fall largely to adults, as the School Lunch Program, the School Milk Program and the Child Nutrition Act direct the full force of their efforts to supplying the nutrition needs of children. Other Federal programs aid in the care of preschool children.

The National School Lunch Act was approved by the Congress in 1946, the Special Milk Program in 1954. The Child Nutrition Act, approved in 1966, provided for school breakfast and aiding schools in obtaining equipment to handle the lunch and breakfast programs. There now is awaiting action in the Committee on Agriculture an administration-sponsored amendment to the Child Nutrition Act authorizing food service for children participating in group situations away from home such as child day-care centers, settlement houses, and day camps as long as these are nonresidential types of situations. Included during the summer months would be children engaged in summer recreational programs.

CONCLUSION

The committee commends the care with which the Food Stamp Program has been organized and administered, on the basis of the information presented in the public hearings on H.R. 1318. The program is an expression of the beneficent spirit of America. This spirit in recent years has been called forth in a proliferation of Government agencies rendering services to the poor, to an extent that the operations of all the programs are difficult if not impossible to understand and to follow. The best assurance that the programs work well is to see that they are not abused. Therefore, the committee in H.R. 1318, as amended, assures frequent legislative review of the Food Stamp Program and broadens the involvement of States and localities, to see that this program aids worthy persons in need of better nutrition and does not diminish the self-reliance of any of our citizens.

Departmental Comment

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1967.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, Public Law 88–525.

This bill would amend section 16 of the Food Stamp Act. It would provide appropriation authority for fiscal years beyond 1967. No other change in the substantive legislative authorities for the Food Stamp Program is deemed necessary at this time.

Public Law 88–525, approved by the President on August 31, 1964, contemplated the progressive expansion of the program—over the period of the next several years—to those States and political subdivisions that desired to participate. That act, however, provided appropriation authorities only through the fiscal year 1967. It is necessary, therefore, that section 16 of the act be amended to provide

appropriation authorities to implement that policy of orderly and progressive program expansion.

When the Food Stamp Act was approved, the program was then operating in 43 areas—in 22 States—in which the food stamp approach had been carefully tested during a 3-year "pilot" period. Since then, the pace of the authorized expansion has, in fact, not kept pace with requests from States for the program. Nonetheless, by the end of the 1967 fiscal year, the program will be operating in about 800 areas in 41 States and the District of Columbia.

In requesting appropriation authority beyond 1967, it is contemplated that the policy of orderly and progressive year-to-year expansion would be continued. Such a policy would continue to permit State welfare agencies and this Department to provide the administrative organization and program supervision that is needed to insure the effective and efficient use of Federal funds in support of program objectives.

Action to assure States that the program will be continued beyond June 30, 1967, should be taken at the earliest possible date. If the future of the program for the next fiscal year remains in doubt, States will hesitate to complete 1967 fiscal year expansion plans—much less undertake the longer range plans to build the administrative organization needed to adequately supervise already operating programs.

The actual level of the annual appropriation for each fiscal year beyond 1967 would be determined by the Congress under the annual appropriation process. Additionally, because the proposed bill is concerned only with the continuation of appropriation authorities, it would not affect program cost or employment requirements for the program.

The Bureau of the Budge advises that the presentation of this report is consistent with the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

TABLE I.—*Food Stamp Program—Selected program statistics for specified months*

Item	For the month of—				
	August 1964	June 1965	June 1966	January 1967 (preliminary)	June 1967 (projection)
Number of States	22	29	[1] 41	[1] 42	[1] 43
Number of areas	43	110	324	589	875
Number of participants	350,550	632,687	1,218,399	1,439,000	2,000,000
Number of retail food stores	13,300	18,000	42,200	51,900	88,000
Number of wholesale food stores	700	1,000	1,500	1,700	2,000
Monthly value of coupons issued:					
Total coupons	$5,865,057	$10,639,497	$20,577,786	$24,402,000	$34,000,000
Bonus coupons	$2,235,405	$3,988,717	$7,398,372	$8,812,000	$12,240,000
Percent of bonus coupons	38	37	36	36	36
Bonus coupons per person	$6.38	$6.30	$6.07	$6.12	$6.12

[1] Includes the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted amendments which change this bill in three major respects.

H.R. 1318 as introduced would have permanently extended the program by removing any legislative ceiling on annual appropriations for its operation.

The committee amendments (1) extend the appropriations authority for 1 more year through June 30, 1968, (2) place a ceiling of $195 million on the amount of funds that can be appropriated for the program during fiscal year 1968 ($195 million is the exact amount requested by the President in the administrative budget for fiscal year 1968), and (3) give the several States participating or planning to participate in the Food Stamp Program ample notice that beginning July 1, 1969, each participating State or political subdivision thereof will pay 20 percent of the bonus value of the food stamps issued to eligible households.

The committee feels that the principle of State sharing in Federal welfare programs generally is sound and should be incorporated in the Food Stamp Program as soon as possible, but it recommends that ample time be given to State legislatures, particularly those which meet biannually, to appropriate sufficient funds to keep the program in operation.

The committee also takes cognizance of the fact that "section 32" (sec. 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Cong., as amended) has in the past been used as a statutory basis for the inauguration and implementation of Food Stamp Programs. The committee therefore specifically intends that the words "Notwithstanding any other provision of law" which appear at the beginning of the proposed section 15(c) of the act be construed to prohibit the Secretary from paying 100 percent of the bonus value of food stamps after July 1, 1969, under the authority of section 32 or any other existing law. On the contrary, the committee intends to establish clearly that beginning July 1, 1969, the participating States shall share 20 percent of a cost which is now borne exclusively by the Federal Government. During the committee's consideration of the 20 percent State cost-sharing amendment several arguments were presented against it.

First, it was argued that the States will not contribute toward the cost of food stamps issued to nonpublic assistance recipients in that particular State. The committee, however, feels that the proper standard for welfare aid should be set by the States and not by the Federal Government. Federal cost sharing of local welfare expenses should be based on the standards the States are willing to establish for themselves. The committee also points out that no State is compelled to participate in the Food Stamp Program and if it chooses not to do so, its citizens remain eligible for the Department of Agriculture's Direct Distribution Program which operates throughout the United States.

A *second* argument was that their financial resources are so limited that the States cannot afford to provide the 20-percent matching that is required by this amended bill. The committee points out that just as States now tax their citizens to raise funds to match the Federal highway program, the aid to dependent children program, and a host of other Federal-State programs, they can likewise be expected to move to meet a modest share of the cost of this program. More important, the committee feels, State and local cost sharing will bring greater local responsibility and control into the operation of this program.

A *third* argument was that some States might require those communities least able to afford it to bear part of the program's cost. The committee feels that this is an issue to be resolved by the States themselves. If there are certain areas which need special assistance in a State, the State government can and should allocate priorities as to which communities are in the most need.

A *fourth* argument was that the States now pay a significant cost in administering the program at the State level. The U.S. Department of Agriculture informed the committee that this "significant cost" is $5 million during the present fiscal year. On the other hand, the Department is currently spending $6 million annually on administrative expenses and employs 831 employees (100 in Washington, D.C., and 731 in the field) to administer the 875 local food stamp programs which will be operational as of June 30, 1967. In addition, the committee points out that section 15(b) authorizes the Secretary to pay part of the State administrative costs concerned with the certification of nonpublic assistance food stamp recipients. The committee feels that the States' contribution toward administrative expenses for its own welfare programs does not remove their responsibility to share in the cost of the Food Stamp Program.

A *fifth* argument was that 60 percent of the people participating in the Food Stamp Program receive State welfare grants and therefore the States are already contributing enough. The committee points out, however, that these welfare State grants would be made regardless of the existence of the Food Stamp Program. Under the present program eligible recipients take their own money, be it from State welfare or from some other source, and exchange it for food stamps having a greater value (on the average about $10 cash for $16 worth of stamps). The U.S. taxpayer pays the $6 difference in full. It is this Federal welfare outlay that the committee feels should be matched in part by the States.

A *sixth* argument was that taxpayers in counties not covered by the Food Stamp Program would resent paying State taxes to be used to contribute to the cost of the program in other counties in the same State. This argument, the committee feels, is basically the same as argument No. 3 above. This issue is simply one for each State to resolve. If a State decides to place a road through its western part, the people in the eastern part help pay the taxes to build that road. Conversely, if the people in an eastern county of that same State need the Food Stamp Program, those who live in the western part will help pay the necessary taxes to finance that assistance if the State government, through its Governor and its legislature, so decides.

A *final* argument was that States would begin to look upon the Food Stamp Program as a welfare program, rather than a Federal food program. To this argument the committee submits the proposition that the Food Stamp Program *is* primarily a welfare program. The fact is that States have already recognized it as such and are looking upon it as an additional source of "free" aid from the Federal Government. The committee further submits that there is nothing wrong with a good Federal welfare program if it incorporates appropriate sharing of responsibility by State governments.

In brief the committee amendment to require modest State cost sharing is not designed to wreck the Food Stamp Program. Rather, it is intended to structure State and local participation and responsi-

bility into a basic welfare program designed primarily to benefit our needy citizens.

Changes in Existing Law

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

Food Stamp Act of 1964

* * * * * * *

COOPERATION WITH STATE AGENCIES

Sec. 15. (a) Each State shall be responsible for financing, from funds available to the State or political subdivision thereof, the costs of carrying out the administrative responsibilities assigned to it under the provisions of this Act. Except as provided for in subsection (b) of this section, such costs shall include, but shall not be limited to, the certification of households; the acceptance, storage, and protection of coupons after their delivery to receiving points within the States; and the issuance of such coupons to eligible households and the control and accounting therefor.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to cooperate with State agencies in the certification of households which are not receiving any type of public assistance so as to insure the effective certification of such households in accordance with the eligibility standards approved under the provisions of section 10 of this Act. Such cooperation shall include payments to State agencies for part of the cost they incur in the certification of such households. The amount of such payment to any one State agency shall be 50 per centum of the sum of: (1) the direct salary costs (including the cost of such fringe benefits as are normally paid to its personnel by the State agency) of the personnel used to make such interviews and such postinterview field investigations as are necessary to certify the eligibility of such households, and of the immediate supervisor of such personnel, for such periods of time as they are employed in certifying the eligibility of such households; (2) travel and related costs incurred by such personnel in postinterview field investigations of such households; and (3) an amount not to exceed 25 per centum of the costs computed under (1) and (2) above.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each State shall be responsible for financing, from funds available to the State or political subdivision thereof, 20 per centum of the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments. Each State shall transfer such sums to, and they shall be made a part of, the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. Each State shall transfer such sums to such account within one calendar month following the calendar month in which the coupon allotments are issued to eligible households. The provisions of this subsection shall not be effective for any coupon allotments issued prior to July 1, 1969, to enable each State to take such action as is necessary under the statutes of the State to comply with the provisions of this subsection.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 16. (a) To carry out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; not in excess of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; [and] not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; *not in excess of $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968;* and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year. Such portion of any such appropriation as may be required to pay for the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments shall be transferred to and made a part of the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act.

(b) In any fiscal year, the Secretary shall limit the value of those coupons issued which is in excess of the value of coupons for which households are charged, to an amount which is not in excess of the portion of the appropriation for such fiscal year which is transferred to the separate account under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. If in any fiscal year the Secretary finds that the requirements of participating States will exceed the limitation set forth herein, the Secretary shall direct State agencies to reduce the amount of such coupons to be issued to participating households to the extent necessary to comply with the provisions of this subsection.

(c) If the Secretary determines that any of the funds in the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act are no longer required to carry out the provisions of this Act, such portion of such funds shall be paid into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

(d) Amounts expended under the authority of this Act shall not be considered amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the agricultural price-support program and appropriations for the purposes of this Act shall be considered, for the purpose of budget presentations, to relate to the functions of the Government concerned with welfare. (7 U.S.C. 2025.)

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF THOMAS S. FOLEY

I concur with the majority report that the Food Stamp Program should be continued and further expanded.

I am opposed to the committee amendment that would require, beginning July 1, 1969, that States or localities match 20 percent of the bonus cost of the coupons, in addition to the cost of intrastate program administration. That provision would make the program largely inoperative.

1. States are now sorely pressed to find the revenues to support their basic public assistance and general relief programs. In fact, the principal need for a Federal food assistance program stems from the fact that States and localities have been unable to finance a public assistance program that would provide a minimum level of food consumption for low-income families.

2. The States that now are most in need of the Food Stamp Program are the States that are now not taking full advantage of the available Federal moneys for public assistance because they have been unable to raise the required State or local tax funds. Therefore, the committee amendment will work to foreclose such States from taking advantage of the Food Stamp Program.

3. The States would have the alternative of passing on such costs to local political subdivisions. But, again, this would mean that the communities most in need of the Food Stamp Program would be the ones that would be least able to raise the required funds.

4. The States and/or localities *now* are required to finance the costs of program administration. The Department of Agriculture estimates that such costs typically run to about 7 percent of the value of the bonus coupons. In fact, during the committee hearings, it was reported that some of the localities which need the program have found it difficult to raise the funds that are required to cover these costs. To believe, therefore, that they could absorb 20 percent of the subsidy cost itself is unrealistic.

5. About 60 percent of the people now participating in the Food Stamp Program are receiving welfare grants under State or local relief funds. It is out of these grants that the families are purchasing their food coupons. So States and localities are also indirectly contributing significant sums to the program—in the form of the moneys used by welfare people to make regular coupon purchases.

6. It will be necessary for such States to contribute to the cost of the bonus coupons for both families receiving public assistance and to those families not receiving public assistance. Many of these latter families are not on public assistance because the State has been unable to finance a welfare program that was broad enough to meet their needs. For example, less than half the States have been able to take advantage of the expanded

aid to dependent children with unemployed parents (ADC–UP) even though that broader program has been authorized since 1961. Therefore, it is unrealistic to believe those States would find it possible to meet the food stamp matching requirements proposed by the committee.

7. The adverse impact of this committee amendment is *immediate*—not something that will be faced 2 years from now. States will not continue to expand a program that they know they will have to abandon by 1969.

8. The Food Stamp Program has been a highly popular, effectively operated program. Its purpose has been well defined and it has been operated in a manner that preserves its food objectives. Contrary to the views of some, it does not lessen the State's responsibility for its basic welfare and relief programs. Rather it builds upon those efforts—increasing the food and nutrition of low-income families and is closely connected with the objectives of related State progarms.

In summary a requirement that States contribute 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons—no matter how logical from the standpoint of Federal-State cooperation—is a requirement that many States will be unable to meet. They will be forced to return to the direct donation of federally owned foods which experience has demonstrated is far less effective and efficient. This would be a serious backward step in the national need to make use of our food abundance and the productive capacity of our farmers.

The committee amendment should be rejected.

THOMAS S. FOLEY.

MINORITY REPORT

Contents

This minority report sets forth the following subjects:

I. General statement.
II. Background of food stamp legislation, 1939–43:
  A. The food stamp plan operated between 1939 and 1943.
  B. The food stamp plan from 1943 to 1961.
  C. The pilot Food Stamp Program 1961–64.
  D. The Food Stamp Act of 1964.
III. An inefficient program
  A. Low cost-benefit ratio.
  B. Ballooning bureaucracy.
IV. Rejection of food stamp plan would not halt food aid to needy:
  A. Donations under direct distribution program:
  B. The direct distribution program—How it works.
  C. How the food stamp plan works.
V. Implications of a nationwide food stamp program.
VI. Committee amendment on State cost sharing.
VII. Summary.

I. General Statement

We oppose the extension of the Food Stamp Program as proposed by H.R. 1318, as amended by the committee.

The present Food Stamp Program is rapidly growing toward a nationwide Federal welfare activity which is structured in an inefficient manner that is progressively destroying State and local responsibility while doing next to nothing for the benefit of American agriculture and failing to meet the needs of truly destitute persons.

II. Background of Food Stamp Legislation, 1939–67

A. The food stamp plan operated between 1939 and 1943

Scope of the plan

The food stamp plan began as an experiment in May 1939, in Rochester, N.Y.; it was then extended to five additional experimental areas. The administrative and operating techniques developed in these experimental areas formed the groundwork for the further expansion of the program.

As measured by the number of participants, the plan reached its peak in May 1941, when approximately 4 million people participated. New geographic areas were brought into the plan after 1941, but it never operated on a nationwide basis. The peak in area participation was reached in August 1942, when 1,741 counties and 88 cities were included. The plan was discontinued in early 1943 when wartime

conditions had greatly reduced unemployment and greatly increased demands upon U.S. food supplies.

Basic operating principles

The plan was designed to insure that the Federal contribution represented a net increase in food expenditures among participating families through the use of a two-color stamp system. Participating families were required to exchange an amount of money representing estimated normal food expenditures for orange stamps of the same monetary value. With these orange stamps, participants were provided—without cost—additional blue stamps which could be used to buy designated surplus foods. In this manner, the plan attempted to concentrate the additional food purchasing power on surplus foods, i.e., foods that were experiencing marketing difficulties.

Determining normal food expenditures

To accomplish the basic objectives of the food stamp plan, participants were required to buy orange stamps in amounts about equal to their normal food expenditures. At the inception of the program, it was assumed that the normal range of food purchases of relief families was $4 to $6 per person per month. With each dollar of orange stamps purchased, the recipient received half again as much in free blue stamps.

Operating experience, together with the results of food purchase studies, demonstrated that the uniform minimum requirement of orange stamp purchases of $4 per month per person was not workable. It was determined that greater effectiveness would be obtained if the orange stamp purchase requirements were based upon total cash income available and the number of individuals eating at the family table. Although basic nationwide tables were prepared on this income basis of issuance, it was realized that variations existed between areas and that allowances had to be made. Regional directors were given the responsibility for determining the actual minimum and maximum orange stamp purchase requirements for each program area, provided that the requirements came within the national limits established.

Certification of participants

In general, the persons eligible for participation in the food stamp plan were householders who prepared and ate their meals in the home, and who were eligible for public assistance in the area in which they lived. Usually participation was limited to those persons receiving general assistance, old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, State unemployment relief, and those receiving assistance from WPA in the form of employment.

As the plan moved to an income basis of issuance, the problems of certification increased. It was necessary not only to verify the relief status of the applicant family but to also verify its money income and family size. The plan required regular reinvestigations to determine the continued eligibility of all persons certified. It was here that the certifying agencies met with tremendous difficulties. With the mounting number of participants in the program, the number of caseworkers available in the certifying agencies was insufficient to make reinvestigations within a reasonable time. In some areas, a caseworker had from 500 to 1,000 families on his list.

Designation of blue stamp (surplus) foods

Foods were designated as blue stamp (surplus) food each month by the Secretary of Agriculture. Participating retailers were required to post a notice of these monthly designations in their stores. One of the advantages of this requirement was to bring these foods to the attention of all customers and, thus, encourage increased purchases of the surplus foods among the nonparticipating (higher income) families.

During the operation of the plan, more than 30 food commodities were placed on the blue stamp list. Included in the listing were butter, shell eggs, cereal products, potatoes, dry beans, fresh vegetables, fresh and dried fruits, pork meat products, and lard and shortening.

In many months, the blue stamp list included too large a number of surplus commodities, considering the total amount of additional food purchasing power provided under the plan. As a result, the additional purchasing power appeared to be too thinly spread to have significant impact on the demand situation for any particular surplus food.

Stamp redemption

The Department of Agriculture supplied food stamp cards to participating retailers on which stamps were to be pasted prior to their presentation for redemption. These cards carried space for $10 worth of stamps.

There were three methods by which the stamps could be redeemed: The retailer could file a claim directly with the Department of Agriculture, he could submit them to this wholesaler to the credit of his account, or he could redeem them at his local bank. Wholesalers throughout the country cooperated in the plan by accepting stamp cards from retailers in payment of accounts. Banks performed the redemption services for retailers and wholesalers without charge. However, as the plan developed there was some dissatisfaction expressed because of the volume of work required and banks increasingly expressed the opinion that they were entitled to payment for the work performed.

Problems of noncompliance

Two of the most frequent noncompliance problems were (1) the sale of nonsurplus foods for blue stamps or the sale of nonfood items for stamps, and (2) cash purchase by grocers of blue stamps from participating families.

Originally, major reliance for compliance with program regulations was placed upon the policy of self-policing, together with an educational program for participating retailers. This soon had to be supplemented with a more specific compliance and investigation program. In an effort to reduce the number of violations, each participating retailer was required to sign a special form, acknowledging his understanding of program regulations and his responsibility for any violations committed by his employees. This form was valid for a definite period of time—usually 6 months—and had to be renewed in person. Later on, a compliance bond was required of retailers.

Administrative sanctions were used to penalize retailers who sold nonfood items for stamps or nonsurplus food for blue stamps. When violations involved illegal trafficking in stamps or exchange of stamps for cash, legal sanctions could be imposed. Sections 286, 287, and

1001 of title 18, United States Code, provide for fines and imprisonment for presenting false claims or conspiring to defraud the U.S. Government. Further, section 231 of title 31 of the code provides heavy civil liability for false claims.

Another problem encountered was that of insuring continuity of participation among families entering the plan. If, for example the families purchased stamps only every other week, it provided a means of carrying over the blue stamps to supplement below-normal food expenditures during the weeks of nonparticipation. Thus, little, if any, increase in the food expenditures of such participants was achieved. Difficulties with intermittent participation were marked during the early days of the plan but decreased considerably as additional experience was gained by both participants and program administrators.

Program administration

The plan was first administered by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, and later by the Surplus Marketing Administration, Agricultural Marketing Administration, and the Food Distribution Administration of the Department. The United States was divided into four regions, each with a regional director who was given considerable discretionary powers to carry out program policy and procedures.

A city or a county (or a combination of both) constituted an area in the administration of the plan. In the selection of areas for participation, a duly constituted authority from the area (such as the Governor of the State, the mayor of a city, or the county board of supervisors) petitioned the Secretary of Agriculture for designation. Medium-sized communities were first designated and, as the techniques of operation were improved, the plan was set up in large metropolitan areas. Rural areas presented special problems in administration—income certification was difficult because of the importance of nonmoney income and home-produced food; the grocery stores were scattered; the number of participants small; and the central stamp issuing offices few.

The wholehearted cooperation of welfare and other public officials, food retailers, and banks in the designated areas was essential to the success of the plan. It was necessary that the local governing body maintain a revolving fund to reimburse the Government for the orange stamps received by its issuing offices, to be responsible for the proper issuance of the free blue stamps, and to provide the personnel, space, and fixtures necessary for the issuance of food stamps to certified eligibles. The area, however, was reimbursed for the orange stamps from the proceeds of sales to stamp recipients. To provide assurance that such responsibilities would be executed, agreements were negotiated between the Department of Agriculture and the governing body of the area.

Effect on participants' food expenditures

During the 46 months the plan was in operation, the additional food purchasing power provided to participants by the Federal Government totaled $260 million. It has been estimated that this supplemental purchasing power amounted to an average of 4 percent of total food sales in some of the cities where the plan operated. However, had the plan been available to all families receiving general

welfare or Work Projects Administration assistance during 1939–43, it has been estimated that the cost of the Federal contribution would have been about $400 million a year. An additional $200 to $240 million would have been required annually to extend the plan to all urban families with incomes of less than $1,000 a year.

There is no doubt but what the plan did increase food consumption levels among participating groups. However, it proved to be more effective in increasing participants' expenditures on some surplus foods than on others. In general, it had its greatest effect upon those foods most responsive to income changes; i.e., animal products and most fruits and vegetables.

While the two-color stamp system was employed to help insure that the additional food money provided was spent on surplus foods, that system could not guarantee increased purchases of each food on the list. A participant who did not wish to purchase larger quantities of a particular surplus food could do so by buying his usual quantities with blue stamps and using none of his orange stamps for such purposes. With the relatively large number of items on the blue stamp list, participants had considerable freedom of choice in determining the surplus foods for which their blue stamps would be used. For this reason, there is serious doubt as to whether the two-color stamp system (which introduced many complexities into the operation of the plan), had a significant effect upon the kinds of additional food purchased by the recipients.

B. THE FOOD STAMP PLAN FROM 1943 TO 1961

From the time the first food stamp program was dropped in 1943 until 1961, the Department of Agriculture under the leadership of Secretaries Wickard, Anderson, Brannan, and Benson did not reinstate it. The basic authority in "section 32" used in 1939–43 remained in effect but it was not used.

In the mid-1950's some congressional support to reactivate the food stamp program developed. In the 85th Congress, H.R. 13067, a bill to establish a nationwise food stamp program was defeated in the House of Representatives.

In the 86th Congress, legislation which authorized a nationwide food stamp plan was enacted.[1] It was later repealed by the 89th Congress.[2]

That provision of law, which was adopted as an amendment to Public Law 480 in 1959, contained these salient features:

1. It applied for a 2-year period running from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1962;
2. It was discretionary with the Secretary as to whether a program would be initiated or not;
3. It authorized an annual appropriation of $250 million, including the cost of the surplus foods donated;
4. It was limited to only surplus foods acquired by CCC under the price-support program or under "section 32";
5. The program would be available to local governments only if requested by them; and
6. The Secretary was directed to report to Congress within 6 months of the enactment on the possible expansion of the program.

[1] The act of Sept. 21, 1959, 73 Stat. 608, 7 U.S.C. 1695.
[2] The act of Nov. 11, 1966, 80 Stat. 1535, Public Law 89-808.

Secretary Benson did not exercise his discretionary authority to use this program. Neither did Secretary Freeman, who relied instead on the broad language of "section 32" for the pilot programs.

On February 1, 1962, this authority expired and it is no longer in effect. The administration did not seek its extension or amendment.

C. THE PILOT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM, 1961–64

On May 25, 1961, the first pilot food stamp project was inaugurated in McDowell County, W. Va. Approximately 1 month later seven other pilot projects were opened in Franklin County, Ill.; Floyd County, Ky.; Detroit, Mich.; the Virginia-Hibbing-Nashwauk complex in northern Minnesota; Silver Bow County, Mont.; San Miguel County, N. Mex.; and Fayette County, Pa.

From 1961 to 1964 the pilot program expanded to 43 projects in 22 States.

The statutory authority and source of funds for the pilot programs was clause (2) of "section 32" which provides:

SECTION 32 OF PUBLIC LAW 320, 74TH CONGRESS

> SEC. 32. There is hereby appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, an amount equal to 30 per centum of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year. Such sums shall be maintained in a separate fund and shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture only to * * * (1) * * *; (2) encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them, by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means, from the normal channels of trade and commerce or by increasing their utilization through benefits, indemnities, donations, *or by other means*, among persons in low-income groups as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture; and (3) * * *. [Emphasis added.]

This is the same statutory authority used in 1939–43. The specific food stamp statute which expired in 1962 was never used.

As can readily be seen, the pilot program rested entirely on the four words "or by other means" and the regulations issued by the Department of Agriculture thereunder.

D. THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964—H.R. 10222 AND FOOD STAMP LEGISLATION IN THE 88TH CONGRESS

On April 22, 1963, the administration bill, H.R. 5733, was introduced in the House of Representatives. On June 10, 11, and 12, 1963, the Committee on Agriculture held 3 days of hearings.

A Special Subcommittee on Food Stamps then considered H.R. 5733 and three committee prints.

A clean bill, H.R. 8107, was introduced on August 15, 1963. This bill was considered by the full Committee on Agriculture on February 4, 1964, and it was tabled by a rollcall vote of 19 to 14.

On February 18, 1964, another bill, slightly different from H.R. 8107, was introduced. Then on March 3 still another slightly different bill was introduced as H.R. 10222.

The next day, March 4, 1964, the Committee on Agriculture ordered H.R. 10222 reported to the House, with amendments, by a rollcall vote of 18 to 16 with one member of the committee not voting and two members reserving the right to oppose the bill on the floor of the House.

The bill was brought to the floor of the House on April 7 and 8, 1964, at the same time the famous "cotton-wheat" bill was being considered in the House.

As a result of a series of extraordinary events, both the cotton-wheat bill and the food stamp bill were passed on April 8. These extraordinary events were as follows:

1. At 2:06 p.m. the House recessed to participate in lying-in-state ceremonies for the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur (Congressional Record, Apr. 8, 1964, p. 7290).

2. At 3:55 p.m. the recess ended and the House commenced debate on H.R. 10222, the food stamp bill (Congressional Record, Apr. 8, 1964, p. 7290).

3. At the conclusion of debate an engrossed copy of the bill was demanded prior to the motion to recommit and final passage (Congressional Record, Apr. 8, 1964, p. 7303).

4. Debate commenced on the cotton-wheat bill (Congressional Record, Apr. 8, 1964, p. 7303).

5. At 6 p.m. the Chair declared another recess and at 9:04 p.m. the House was called. The following parliamentary colloquy occurred:

> Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.
>
> The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.
>
> Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago the speaker declared a recess. Am I to understand that that was done under the unanimous-consent request that was given yesterday for the MacArthur ceremonies in the Capitol?
>
> The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the unanimous-consent request made by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Albert), was as follows:
>
> "Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday and Thursday for the Chair to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair."
>
> Mr. HALLECK. In other words, Mr. Speaker, that conferred blanket authority, but is it not also true that what we had in mind were the MacArthur ceremonies?
>
> The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the unanimous-consent request gave authority to the Chair to declare a recess (Congressional Record, April 8, 1964, pp. 7373–7374).

6. Later the motion to recommit was defeated and the food stamp bill was passed 229 to 189 and eventually became Public Law 88–525, the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (Congressional Record, Apr. 8, 1964, pp. 7307–7308).

7. House Resolution 665, dealing with the cotton-wheat bill, was immediately called up for consideration in the House.

The late Honorable Clarence Brown of Ohio made the following observation:

Mr. Brown of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this has been a rather unusual and historic day. There have been many happenings today. The House has stopped in its deliberations today, as did the other body, to pay respects to one of the greatest Americans of all time, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Perhaps for that reason alone this has been a historic day.

Yet we have seen other history made today. Seldom in my experience, and I have been here 26 years, with 46 years in public life, have I been given the opportunity to speak twice on the same piece of legislation during the same day. That has been a rather strange situation.

When I spoke originally today on the resolution that is before us I described it as an unusual parliamentary maneuver seldom resorted to, one to thwart the will of 435 Members of this House and to take away from them, through a rather peculiar, yet legal, method as far as the rules of the House are concerned, but still very peculiar, arrangement whereby, through the adoption of this resolution, we would at the same time accept and approve the amendments adopted by the other body, the Senate, to a cotton bill previously passed by this House, and thereby put into effect an entirely new program for the production of wheat in America, and for other farm products as well.

* * * So I am just hoping now that each and every one of you will search your own heart and souls as to whether or not you have sold your constitutional rights, your prerogatives, your privileges, and your power to represent your own people as your own judgment and your own conscience tells you, for a mess of pottage—for a little handbook of food stamps (Congressional Record, Apr. 8, 1964, pp. 7310–7311).

8. The cotton-wheat bill was then passed 211–203 (Congressional Record, April 8, 1964, p. 7329).

III. An Inefficient Program

The Food Stamp Program is intrinsically inefficient. The cost-benefit ratio between total Federal expenditures and the number of persons receiving benefits is very low, while the ratio of U.S. Government employees to the number of food stamp projects is distressingly high.

A. LOW COST-BENEFIT RATIO

The fiscal year 1968 administrative budget calls for $195 million to finance the Food Stamp Program in the upcoming fiscal year. By June 30, the Department states, there will be approximately 2 million people receiving food stamps. Put another way, it takes $195 million to subsidize the food supply of 2 million people under the Food Stamp Program. In other programs such as school lunch, for example, the results are much better. In the school lunch program over 15 million children receive hot lunches from a Federal-State program toward which the Federal Government contributes $226 million. Put another way, $226 million (slightly more than the food stamp appropriation) helps subsidize the lunches of 15 million people (over seven times as many as the Food Stamp Program).

B. BALLOONING BUREAUCRACY

Programs like the Food Stamp Program are hastening the day when the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture will exceed the number of farms in America.

There are now some 589 food stamp project areas with a scheduled expansion to 875 by June 30, 1967. At the same time there are 831 employees in the U.S. Department of Agriculture administering the program. With some 3,200 counties and numerous cities in the United States, it is obvious that the food stamp bureaucracy in the Agriculture Department will continue to grow and grow unless something is done now to check this inefficient method of providing welfare aid.

IV. Rejection of Food Stamp Plan Would Not Halt Food Aid to Needy

One important point to bear in mind about the Food Stamp Program is that no recipients, no matter how needy they may be, get free food. Even the most destitute recipients are required to contribute a portion of their meager income toward the cost of the food stamps.

The Food Stamp Program is merely a food subsidy to people who already have money; not food aid to those who have no money.

The Direct Distribution Program of the Department, however, provides a variety of foods to the needy regardless of the fact that they do not have any money.

A. DONATIONS UNDER DIRECT DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

The following USDA press release of March 3, 1967, shows the magnitude of the present Direct Distribution Program which has operated for the past 32 years, which now operates in non-food-stamp areas, and which would continue to operate if the Food Stamp Program were terminated:

USDA FOOD DONATIONS BENEFITED MILLIONS IN FIRST HALF OF FISCAL 1967

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, March 3, 1967.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman reported today that U.S. Department of Agriculture food assistance programs were available to needy people and schoolchildren in more communities during the first half of fiscal 1967 (July–December 1966) than during the same period a year earlier.

At the end of December 1966, 1,498 counties and 114 cities were distributing USDA foods to needy families. In addition, USDA's Food Stamp Program functioned in another 477 areas. In the same month of 1965, the Secretary said, foods were being distributed in 1,606 counties and 247 cities, while the Food Stamp Program was available in 191 areas.

USDA's food donation program functioning in all 50 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the

Trust Territory of the Pacific, during the first half of fiscal 1967, benefited 3.6 million persons in family units, 1.3 million needy adults and children in charitable institutions, 1.3 million children in nonprofit summer camps, and 21 million children at school. An additional 1.3 million of the Nation's needy took part in USDA's Food Stamp Program. Comparative figures for 1966 were 4.6 million in family units, 1.3 million needy adults and children in charitable institutions, 1.2 million children in nonprofit summer camps, and 20 million children at school. Some 792,000 of the Nation's needy took part in the Food Stamp Program.

Total USDA domestic food donations during July 1–December 31, 1966, came to an estimated 667.9 million pounds compared with 817.9 million during the same period last year. Needy persons in family units, during the comparable periods, received 355.5 million pounds against 418 million; institutions received 61.8 million pounds against 77.1 million; and schools received 250.6 million pounds against 322.8 million.

The Secretary noted that the list of donated foods varies from time to time, and that some foods may not be available for extensive distribution during any given fiscal quarter or year. Examples of such foods during the first half of fiscal 1967 were butter, cheese, and frozen turkeys for schools. This variation, along with reduced caseloads, accounted for a drop of some 41 percent in the value of total donations in the first half of fiscal 1967 compared with the first half of fiscal 1966. (However, during December 1966, exclusively for schools, USDA was able to buy, at a cost of $62.8 million, some 229 million pounds of foods that had been unavailable. These foods were scheduled for delivery during January-February 1967, and are not a part of the July-December distribution totals. See USDA release 4080–66, dated Dec. 27, 1966.)

Moreover, the school totals do not include additional food that USDA's Consumer and Marketing Service purchases for and distributes exclusively to schools taking part in the national school lunch program.

State and local governments cooperate with USDA's Consumer and Marketing Service to bring these food-assistance programs to needy people in families and institutions, and to schoolchildren. The foods are always available on a priority basis to feed victims of natural disasters.

The following table shows the number of needy persons in family units receiving donated foods in December 1966:

Alabama	117,721	Maine	17,235
Arizona	79,054	Maryland	49,967
Arkansas	78,664	Massachusetts	35,983
California	57,453	Michigan	103,846
Colorado	17,490	Minnesota	29,023
Connecticut	1,418	Mississippi	411,205
Delaware	23,126	Missouri	86,414
Florida	119,556	Montana	14,410
Georgia	139,286	Nebraska	14,131
Idaho	5,000	Nevada	1,888
Illinois	65,510	New Hampshire	6,615
Indiana	41,733	New Jersey	18,725
Iowa	40,410	New Mexico	34,851
Kansas	20,182	New York	404,546
Kentucky	60,800	North Carolina	127,010
Louisiana	35,228	North Dakota	15,992

Ohio	42,074	Vermont	9,991
Oklahoma	219,908	Virginia	7,944
Oregon	53,928	Virgin Islands	3,335
Pennsylvania	94,279	Washington	53,173
Puerto Rico	566,846	West Virginia	51,735
Rhode Island	3,233	Wisconsin	35,988
South Dakota	28,025	Wyoming	3,267
Tennessee	31,487	Trust territory	570
Texas	144,787		
Utah	12,057	Total	3,637,099

The following tables show totals of food acquired under the price-support and surplus-removal operations and donated for domestic distribution during the first half of fiscal 1967 by commodity and cost with comparisons for the previous fiscal year:

Quantities of foods donated for domestic use, fiscal year 1966 and estimated 1st half fiscal year 1967

[In millions of pounds]

Commodity	Schools [1]		Institutions		Needy persons		Total	
	Fiscal year 1966	1st half fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	1st half fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	1st half fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	1st half fiscal year 1967
Beans, dry	15.1	5.3	2.7	1.1	32.9	0.9	50.7	7.3
Beef, canned, natural juices	.5	.2			71.9	2.3	72.4	2.5
Beef, fresh ground and roasts	.9	1.6	(2)				.9	1.6
Bulgur	1.7	1.3	.9	.4	2.0	1.0	4.6	2.7
Butter	95.7	6.0	7.4	(2)	22.7	.2	125.8	6.2
Cheese	13.0	2.6	1.2	(2)	5.8		20.0	2.6
Cherries, canned	9.7	(2)					9.7	(2)
Cherries, frozen	1.5						1.5	
Cornmeal	19.6	11.7	5.9	2.6	112.9	50.0	138.4	64.3
Eggs, dried	.1	(2)	.1	(2)	.1		.3	(2)
Flour	182.0	99.7	70.8	32.5	217.5	90.9	470.3	223.1
Grits, corn	.7	.5	1.4	.6	12.9	7.6	15.0	8.7
Honey	2.0	(2)					2.0	(2)
Lard or shortening	37.5	22.7	9.9	4.6	49.4	20.6	96.8	47.9
Margarine			8.0	7.0	22.9	17.9	30.9	24.9
Meat, canned chopped	1.1	.7			22.4	35.8	23.5	36.5
Milk, nonfat dry	32.0	18.7	13.0	5.5	110.3	47.2	155.3	71.4
Oats, rolled		.1		.1		.5		.7
Olives, canned	.2	(2)					.2	(2)
Onions	.4		.1				.5	
Orange juice, concentrated	8.7	(2)					8.7	(2)
Peaches, fresh	.3		3.7				4.0	
Peanut butter	14.5	12.0			25.7	10.2	40.2	22.2
Pears, canned		17.1						17.1
Peas, dried	3.3	1.6	1.6	.6	17.4	7.3	22.3	9.5
Pecans, shelled	1.5	(2)					1.5	(2)
Plums, canned	(2)	4.5					(2)	4.5
Plums, fresh	.5		3.5				4.0	
Potatoes, sweet	4.5		1.3				5.8	
Prunes, dried, canned	16.5	.3					16.5	.3
Raisins	10.5	8.8			10.0	12.4	20.5	21.2
Rice	30.7	18.0	9.1	4.5	80.7	34.9	120.5	57.4
Turkeys, frozen	29.3	12.3					29.3	12.3
Wheat, rolled	9.0	4.9	4.6	2.3	37.4	15.8	51.0	23.0
Total	543.0	250.6	145.2	61.8	854.9	355.5	1,543.1	667.9

[1] These data do not include foods bought under sec. 6 of the National School Lunch Act and distributed to schools participating in the national school lunch program.
[2] Less than 50,000 pounds.

Cost of foods donated for domestic use, fiscal year 1966 and estimated 1st half fiscal year 1967

[In millions of dollars]

Commodity	Schools [1]		Institutions		Needy persons		Total	
	Fiscal year 1966	1st half fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	1st half fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	1st half fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	1st half fiscal year 1967
Beans, dry	1.2	0.4	0.2	0.1	2.6	0.1	4.0	0.6
Beef, canned, natural juices	.3	.1			36.9	1.2	37.2	1.3
Beef, fresh ground and roasts	.6	1.0	(2)				.6	1.0
Bulgur	.1	.1	.1	(2)	.1	.1	.3	.2
Butter	59.7	3.7	4.6	(2)	14.2	.1	78.5	3.8
Cheese	5.0	1.0	.5	(2)	2.2		7.7	1.0
Cherries, canned	1.2	(2)					1.2	(2)
Cherries, frozen	.2						.2	
Cornmeal	.7	.5	.2	.1	4.2	1.8	5.1	2.4
Eggs, dried	.1	(2)	.1	(2)	.1		.3	(2)
Flour	10.8	5.9	4.2	1.9	12.9	5.4	27.9	13.2
Grits, corn	(2)	(2)	.1	(2)	.7	.4	.8	.4
Honey	.4	(2)					.4	(2)
Lard or shortening	6.3	3.9	1.7	.8	8.3	3.5	16.3	8.2
Margarine			1.3	1.1	3.7	2.9	5.0	4.0
Meat, canned chopped	.6	.3			10.7	17.3	11.3	17.6
Milk, nonfat, dry	5.1	2.9	2.0	.9	17.4	7.5	24.5	11.3
Oats, rolled		(2)		(2)		(2)		(2)
Olives, canned	(2)	(2)					(2)	(2)
Onions	(2)		(2)				(2)	
Orange juice, concentrated	2.1	(2)					2.1	(2)
Peaches, fresh	(2)		.3				.3	
Peanut butter	3.9	3.3			7.0	2.7	10.9	6.0
Pears, canned		2.6						2.6
Peas, dried	.3	.1	.1	.1	1.4	.6	1.8	.8
Pecans, shelled	1.1	(2)					1.1	(2)
Plums, canned	(2)	.4					(2)	.4
Plums, fresh	.1		.4				.5	
Potatoes, sweet	.2		.1				.3	
Prunes, dried, canned	2.3	.1					2.3	.1
Raisins	1.5	1.2			1.4	1.8	2.9	3.0
Rice	3.0	1.8	.9	.4	7.9	3.4	11.8	5.6
Turkeys, frozen	9.5	4.0					9.5	4.0
Wheat, rolled	.6	.3	.2	.2	2.3	.9	3.1	1.4
Total	116.9	33.6	17.0	5.6	134.0	49.7	267.9	88.9

[1] These data do not include foods bought under sec. 6 of the National School Lunch Act and distributed to schools participating in the national school lunch program.
[2] Less than $50,000.

B. THE DIRECT DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM—HOW IT WORKS

The Department of Agriculture acquires surplus foods through agricultural price support and stabilization or surplus removal programs. The purpose of the food donation programs is to assist in the proper disposal of these surplus commodities. These commodities are held in the inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation and are available for sale or other disposal under certain conditions prescribed by law.

When a commodity not covered by price supports encounters serious marketing difficulties, the Department may undertake a one-time or short-term purchase program to remove the surplus from the market.

The quantity purchased under such a surplus removal program is limited by the amount eligible recipients can effectively utilize in a reasonable period because these are commodities that cannot be held in storage for any sustained length of time. Many times, however, the market can be effectively stabilized with an even smaller purchase; if so, purchases are limited to that amount.

The authority for such surplus purchase and donation operations is contained in section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended,[3] and related legislation.

Under the Direct Distribution Program the Department is authorized to donate them to school lunch programs, needy Indians, and for use of needy people in charitable institutions and family units in this country.

If the available surplus food supplies exceed the requirements of the eligible recipients in this country, they may then be offered to U.S. voluntary agencies for distribution to needy people in other countries.

This authority to donate surplus CCC foods for needy persons in other countries as well as at home is contained in section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.[4]

The kind and quantity of surplus foods available change from time to time. As surplus foods become available, the needs of domestic outlets such as schools, institutions, and needy persons are fully met before the foods are offered to needy people abroad. The amount moving to needy families is limited only by the distribution made by State and local authorities.

In donating surplus foods for use by eligible needy people, the Department of Agriculture has in the past followed the accepted principle that the administration of welfare programs is the responsibility of States and local communities. Until the advent of the pilot Food Stamp Program, the Department did not establish a single national standard which the economic need of people is to be determined.

Under the Direct Distribution Program, each State establishes eligibility standards for determining economic need and appropriate public welfare agencies within each State certify needy people to receive surplus food on the basis of these eligibility standards. The Department simply requires that the eligibility standards used by each State bear a close relationship to the eligibility standards used in the State's own welfare program.

Each State makes arrangements with its counties or communities for the certification of eligible families, for the storage and handling of donated foods, and for the operation of a distribution center where certified needy people receive these foods.

The method of surplus food purchase and distribution currently in use in the Direct Distribution Program has been in use for 32 years since such activities were first authorized in 1935. Throughout those years this system has proved to be a simple, efficient, and effective means of distributing surplus foods to needy people. It stabilizes market prices for producers when they market their products, and gets surplus foods to people who need and can make good use of them.

C. HOW THE FOOD STAMP PLAN WORKS

In essence, this is how the pilot Food Stamp Program works:

All qualified persons, whether under State welfare or not, are eligible to participate in the program. The head of the household must make application to the local department of welfare office. To meet the Federal standard, generally the household must meet three basic requirements to be eligible to receive food stamps. First, the applicant

[3] 7 U.S.C. 612c.
[4] 7 U.S.C. 1431.

must be a local resident; second, gross income and liquid assets must be under certain levels established for each household size; and third, cooking facilities must be available to prepare the food in the home. Applicants are required to produce proof of their identity, residence, gross income, assets, and family size. Eligible families must re-establish their eligibility, or be "recertified" periodically to continue their eligibility to receive food stamps. Households are required to report to the local welfare office those changes which affect their status or eligibility for participation in the program.

After a household has been determined eligible, a caseworker then determines under a formula approved by the Secretary of Agriculture the amount of food stamps the household must purchase and the allotment of free stamps. This is generally $16 worth of stamps in return for $10 cash. This determination is based on the number of persons and gross income of the household. The value of free stamps issued is scaled to each household's needs and ability to purchase food.

Eligible applicant families are issued an authorization card which allows them to purchase the designated amount of food stamps and receive the designated amount of free or bonus stamps. The head of household then takes his authorization card together with his food stamp identification card to an appropriate issuing agency (in some counties banks are used) and purchases his food stamps. The stamps may then be used to purchase eligible food items in retail food stores approved for participation in the program. Retail grocers accumulating food stamps deposit them with local banks for cash and they are eventually redeemed for cash by the Department of Agriculture from funds appropriated annually by the Congress.

The Department of Agriculture pays the entire cost of stamps over and above the amount paid by food stamp recipients. (That is, of the $16 worth of stamps, the Federal Government pays $6, the recipient pays $10 and the State pays nothing.) In addition the Department of Agriculture pays all the Federal administrative expenses and part of the States' administrative expenses.

V. Implications of a Nationwide Food Stamp Plan

The present Food Stamp Program (which this bill proposes to extend) provides a so-called free ride for everybody except the U.S. taxpayer, the American farmer, and the acutely poor.

States get so-called "free" aid from the Federal Government to augment their welfare programs, as well as receiving partial payment of their own administrative expenses.

Banks get fees for converting the recipients' cash into food stamps.

Grocers get welfare recipients into their stores to spend the stamps.

The Department of Agriculture runs the program.

With such a "popular" program, is it any wonder that a long line is forming to receive this so-called free Federal aid?

But what about the American farmer? He gets charged for the cost of the program in spite of the fact that no convincing evidence has been produced to show any significant increase in either the volume or the price of the food he sells. The American farmer, in fact, has seen the parity ratio fall monthly to its present low of 74 on March 15 of this year. An extension of this welfare program certainly holds no promise of better farm prices.

But what about the U.S. Treasury? Are we not engaged in the third largest war in our history? Is this a time to expand a completely federally financed welfare program?

But what about the poor people who cannot afford to buy stamps? Why should such a program be extended when better ones are available?

But what check is there on the program itself? How can a local community or a State turn down such an attractive offer? After all, it's free.

Recognizing that there are low-income people in every community, how long will it be before every city and every county in the Nation is covered by a "free" food stamp plan? And what of the cost?

The fiscal year 1968 budget calls for $195 million. Yet only 589 areas were covered by the program in January 1965, with another 286 scheduled to be in operation by June 30. What will the cost be when every city and every county in America climbs aboard the so-called free food stamp train?

Frankly, we are concerned that this program has all the earmarks of being a runaway fiscal drain on the U.S. Treasury unless steps are taken now to curtail it.

For the information of the House, there follows part V of a study prepared by the Department of Agriculture in 1957 pursuant to Public Law 84–540 called An Analysis of Food Stamp Plans. Please note that the Department projected an annual expenditure of $600 million to $2.5 billion for a nationwide Food Stamp Program. Its 1957 predictions are now being borne out by the experience of the present Food Stamp Program.

An Analysis of Food Stamp Plans [5]

V. Estimates of Program Participation and Costs

Potential participation

It is basic to the success of a food stamp plan that participation be limited to those for whom income is a major limitation on the amount of money that can be spent for food. However, there is no exact measure by which to identify such persons and families.

Estimates of potential participation in a stamp plan therefore, must necessarily be made within some defined program scope. The more restrictive are the limitations placed upon income levels for participation, the greater would be the potential increase in food markets per dollar of Federal expenditures; but too restrictive criteria could limit participation to the point where the total additional food purchasing power provided would be too small to have any significant effect on overall domestic food demand. On the other hand as the income levels for participation go up, a larger proportion of the Federal supplement is likely to go to expenditures for higher food quality and more marketing services.

Estimates have been made of potential participation under a program of limited, medium, and maximum scope. It

[5] Submitted to Congress January 3, 1957 by the U.S. Department of Agriculture pursuant to Public Law 540, 84th Congress.

must be emphasized that, in a program of this type, experience demonstrates that actual participation will always be well below any estimate of the number of potentially eligible people. Moreover, considering the high levels of national income and employment, there are some very practical problems to be overcome in reaching the number of people that could be included in a program.

The operation of a stamp program would require an extensive staff on the part of the State agency responsible for the administration of the program. Rather detailed investigations of the financial resources of nonrelief applicants would be necessary and participating families would be subject to periodic recertification. In addition, issuing offices would need to be maintained, at which participating families could regularly purchase their allotments of stamps. In many areas of the country, the general economic conditions would not appear to justify the cost of reaching the relatively small number in the potentially eligible group. As has been true under the family food donation program—which requires a lesser cost on the part of State agencies—it is anticipated that stamp plan operations might largely be confined to areas of economic distress.

Limited scope program.—It appears that the minimum scope for any food stamp plan would be one that confined participation to those persons whose economic position justifies some type of welfare or relief assistance.

According to information maintained by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, about 5 million people are receiving welfare assistance under the Social Security Act. An additional 800,000 persons are receiving some type of State or local relief assistance, but complete reports are not available on assistance programs in which the Federal Government does not participate.

Therefore, under a minimum program, it would be reasonable to expect a potential participation of about 6 million persons.

Medium-scope program.[1]—The probable participation in a medium-scope program has been estimated by establishing the maximum permissible annual money income of participants as $2,500 for a family and $1,000 for single individuals. It is assumed that at these income levels, considerable economies generally are necessary in the amounts of money spent for food.

Based upon 1955 money income distributions, it is estimated that potential participation would be in the neighborhood of 16 million persons in a program of medium scope.

Maximum-scope program.[2]—Potential participation in a program of maximum scope has been estimated by assuming that there is an effective limitation on food expenditures when 40 percent of income is not sufficient to purchase a

[1] Estimates for potential participation under a program of medium and maximum scope have been developed on the basis of nonfarm household income distributions.

[2] Estimates for potential participation under a program of medium and maximum scope have been developed on the basis of nonfarm household income distributions.

basic food allotment. The basic food allotment is a low-cost adequate diet food plan developed by the Department of Agriculture.[3]

At September 1956 retail prices, the basic allotment would have cost about $5.50 per person per week, based on a 4-person family. Based upon the distribution of money incomes in 1955, it is estimated that potential participation in a maximum-scope program could total up to 25 million persons. (See table 2 for a more detailed description of the method used in arriving at this estimate.)

TABLE 2.—*Estimate of number of nonfarm families and unrelated individuals potentially eligible to participate in a Federal food stamp program of maximum scope*

Group	Total number of families in group	Income exclusion points for participation		Percent of family group eligible	Estimated number eligible	
		Based on estimated cost [1]	Used to estimate number eligible		Families	Persons
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Thousands	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Percent*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*
Unrelated individuals	----------	965	Under 800	----------	----------	3,122
Families of:						
2 persons	12,269	1,836	Under 1,500	17.0	2,086	4,172
3 persons	8,738	2,470	Under 2,000	10.7	935	2,805
4 persons	7,985	2,860	Under 2,500	9.0	719	2,866
5 persons	4,512	3,575	Under 3,000	16.4	740	3,700
6 persons	2,084	4,290	Under 3,500	22.2	463	2,778
7 or more persons	1,869	4,755	Under 4,000	41.3	772	5,404
Total:						
Families	37,457	----------	----------	----------	5,715	21,725
Families and individuals	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	24,857

[1] Estimated minimum money income needed by urban families and unrelated individuals to obtain a low-cost adequate diet (the food allotment) with 40 percent of their income. The estimate takes into account economy of family size in food preparation at home. Cost of diet based on September 1956 prices.

Estimated costs to the Federal Government

Costs to the Federal Government would depend upon the scope of the plan—based upon the eligibility criteria established and the extent to which the food purchasing power of participants were to be increased.

As shown in table 2, nonfarm families with an annual money income between $2,000 and $3,000 spent about $2 more per person per week for food than did nonfarm families having incomes under $2,000 a year. It is reasonable, therefore, to try to supplement the food purchasing power of participants by approximately $100 per person per year.

On this basis, the cost to the Federal Government, exclusize of administrative costs, could range from an annual expenditure of $600 million for a program of minimum scope to an annual expenditure of $2.5 billion for a program of maximum scope. With annual retail food store sales in the neighborhood of $50 billion, the additional food purchasing power provided under a food stamp program—considering

[3] This criterion of eligibility has been used in proposed legislation authorizing the operation of a food stamp plan, known as the national food allotment plan.

possible levels of substitution and diversion to nonfood uses—could range from two-thirds of 1 percent for a limited program to a little more than 3 percent for a program of maximum scope.

TABLE 3.—*Estimated changes in food consumption of nonfarm families with incomes of less than $2,000, in 1955, if their consumption patterns were those of families with incomes between $2,000 and $3,000* [1]

Food group	Average consumption per household of 3.5 persons, with incomes under $2,000	Average consumption per household of 3.5 persons, with incomes of $2,000–$3,000	Percent increase
Fresh fruits—pounds	6.82	8.53	25
Fresh vegetables—do	7.42	8.67	17
Canned and frozen fruits and vegetables and juices—pounds	4.79	7.17	50
Dried fruits and vegetables—do	1.08	.88	−19
Potatoes—do	5.79	6.32	9
Meat, poultry, fish—do	10.68	13.60	27
Milk (including nutritional equivalent of cheese, ice cream)—quarts	11.62	13.71	18
Eggs—dozen	1.80	2.00	11
Bakery products—pounds	4.90	6.25	28
Flour, meal, pastes, cereals—do	9.41	7.15	−24
Fats and oils (including butter)—do	2.99	3.05	2
Sugar, sweets—do	4.22	4.24	0
Total food (including nonpurchased)—dollars	18.71	25.12	34
Total food expenditures—do	16.22	23.34	44

[1] Data calculated from Report No. 1 of 1955 household food consumption survey. In this survey approximately 13 percent of the nonfarm housekeeping families had money income less than $2,000 (after tax) for the year 1954.

VI. Committee Amendment on State Cost Sharing

While we endorse the concept of the committee amendment in regard to State sharing in the cost of the food stamp subsidy, we wish to point out that the language adopted by the committee does not require a realistic cost sharing by the States, and the effective date of its application is postponed too far into the future.

The committee amendment requires 20 percent State sharing by July 1, 1969. We recognize that some States have legislatures which only meet biannually and realize that perhaps a special provision could be made in these instances. However, the great majority of the States can and should take appropriate action to participate in the cost of the program long before July 1, 1969.

We also submit that the 20 percent requirement for State cost sharing is far too low. In this respect, we submit the following study prepared by the U.S. Library of Congress on March 24, 1967, at the request of Representative Bob Dole, of Kansas. As this study points out, other Federal welfare-type programs generally require State sharing. Even the poverty program has a 20 percent State cost sharing feature built into it after July 1, 1968. The study is as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1967.

To: Hon. Robert Dole.
From: Education and Public Welfare Division.
Subject: Federal participation in Federal welfare programs.

As you requested, we are updating a memorandum of August 9, 1963, addressed to the Honorable Clifford G. McIntire, and written by Frederick B. Arner and Helen E. Livingston of the Education and Public Welfare Division. In this memorandum, as in the previous one, we are interpreting "Federal welfare programs" to mean the public assistance programs of the Social Security Act—old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to families with dependent children, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, medical assistance to the aged, and the new medical assistance program which was begun last year.

It should be noted that the definition used in the memorandum in 1963 was a limited one. The Federal Government then was engaged in other programs which could have been considered "welfare" in a broader definition. This is more true today because of the variety of programs which have been initiated since the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It can and has been argued that the programs under this act are not "welfare" programs as such, that they do not involve cash welfare payments to the people under them, and that they are, on the contrary, designed to make people self-sufficient so that they will not be dependent on public assistance payments. The work experience programs, however, are aimed primarily at helping unemployed parents, particularly those who are receiving aid to families with dependent children under public assistance, to secure and retain employment. At present these training or work programs can be financed 100 percent by the Federal Government. After July 1, 1968, the Federal share of the total cost of programs will be 80 percent.

1. Are there any Federal welfare programs now in effect under which the entire program cost is borne by the Federal Government? If so, which ones?

No, within the limits of the above definition.

2. Does the Federal Government pay the entire administrative costs of any welfare program?

No, again considering the limited definition of "welfare."

3. In joint Federal-State welfare programs, what is the general ratio of cost sharing? Which programs require State or local participation in their funding?

According to the budget for fiscal 1968, total Federal, State, and local expenditures for the above public assistance programs are estimated at $7,292.6 million. Of this amount $4,263 million, or 58.5 percent, represents the total Federal share. This percentage varies from State to State, inasmuch as part of the matching formula depends upon a State's per capita income. All of the programs require State or local participation in their funding.

4. A chart or table reflecting a list of the various federally sponsored welfare programs, the average annual expenditure of funds for each such program, the amount of Federal participation in dollars and by

percentage, and the degree of Federal participation in the cost of administration expenses:

Payments to or on behalf of recipients

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Old-age assistance:			
Total expenditures (Federal, State, local)	$1,593.0	$1,652.3	$1,637.3
Federal share	$1,075.0	$1,088.2	$1,074.0
Percent, Federal share	67.5	65.9	65.6
Aid to families with dependent children:			
Total expenditures (Federal, State, local)	$1,735.0	$1,972.1	$2,043.1
Federal share	$1,014.8	$1,117.8	$1,145.1
Percent, Federal share	58.5	56.7	56.0
Aid to the blind:			
Total expenditures (Federal, State, local)	$82.9	$84.3	$83.6
Federal share	$46.0	$47.1	$46.6
Percent, Federal share	55.5	55.9	55.7
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled:			
Total expenditures (Federal, State, local)	$449.0	$516.8	$572.8
Federal share	$299.5	$339.8	$370.6
Percent, Federal share	66.7	65.8	64.7
Medical programs:			
Total payments (Federal, State, local)	$1,604.7	$1,925.0	$2,250.7
Federal share	$758.0	$1,021.6	$1,204.7
Percent, Federal share	47.2	53.1	53.5

Source: Dollar figures are taken from the Appendix to the Budget for Fiscal Year 1968; percentages are based on these figures.

State and local administration, services and training

[In millions of dollars]

	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Old-age assistance	156.9	164.0	171.1
Aid to the blind	10.1	10.8	10.8
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	70.4	75.0	83.0
Aid to families with dependent children	321.3	332.7	352.6
Medical assistance	17.1	66.5	84.6
Medical assistance for the aged	35.7	3.1	1.0
Total expenditures (Federal, State, local)	611.5	652.1	703.1
Federal share	359.2	388.0	420.0
Percent, Federal share	58.74	59.5	59.7

Source: Dollar figures are taken from the Appendix to the Budget for Fiscal Year 1968; percentages are based on these figures.

Generally, since 1946, Federal matching of administrative costs has been on a dollar-for-dollar basis for all public assistance programs. There are these present exceptions: the Federal share represents 75 percent of State and local costs of providing preventive and rehabilitative services, and the costs of training State and local personnel; for the last 6 months of 1966 and for 1967 and 1968 the Federal share also includes costs under title 19 (medical assistance) at the 75-percent rate for services of skilled professional medical personnel to improve the administration of medical assistance.

MARGARET MALONE.

VII. SUMMARY

To summarize, we oppose H.R. 1318 as amended, because it proposes an ineffective extension of an inefficient, unnecessary, and

unduly costly Federal welfare program. The Food Stamp Program has, since 1939, proven to be the wrong way to go about meeting the food needs of low-income Americans. The present program, with its fiscal folly of 100 percent Federal financing and its ballooning bureaucracy, threatens both local initiative and local responsibility. A vote against H.R. 1318 is a vote for American taxpayers, farmers, and the truly needy.

PAGE BELCHER.
CHARLES M. TEAGUE.
ROBERT DOLE.
GEORGE V. HANSEN.
GEORGE A. GOODLING.
J. HERBERT BURKE.
ROBERT B. MATHIAS.
ROBERT D. PRICE.
JOHN T. MYERS.
JOHN R. RARICK.

○

Union Calendar No. 81

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1318

[Report No. 189]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

APRIL 12, 1967

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out ~~"and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year"~~ and substituting therefor ~~"and for each subsequent fiscal year such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."~~ *the word "and" the first time it appears therein and by*

inserting after the word "1967;" the words "not in excess of $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968;".

SEC. 2. Section 15 of the Food Stamp Act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each State shall be responsible for financing, from funds available to the State or political subdivision thereof, 20 per centum of the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments. Each State shall transfer such sums to, and they shall be made a part of, the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. Each State shall transfer such sums to such account within one calendar month following the calendar month in which the coupon allotments are issued to eligible households. The provisions of this subsection shall not be effective for any coupon allotments issued prior to July 1, 1969, to enable each State to take such action as is necessary under the statutes of the States to comply with the provisions of this subsection."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964."

Union Calendar No. 81

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1318

[Report No. 189]

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN

JANUARY 10, 1967

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

APRIL 12, 1967

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

April 14, 1967

13. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 17. p. S5260

HOUSE

14. FOOD STAMP PROGRAM. H. R. 1318 as introduced would have permanently extended the food stamp program by removing any legislative ceiling on annual appropriations for its operation. As reported (Apr. 12), the Agriculture Committee amendments change this bill in three major respects to (1) extend the appropriations authority for 1 more year through June 30, 1968, (2) place a ceiling of $195 million on the amount of funds that can be appropriated for the program during fiscal year 1968, and (3) give the States participating or planning to participate in the Food Stamp Program notice that beginning July 1, 1969, each participating State or political subdivision thereof will pay 20 percent of the bonus value of the food stamps issued to eligible households.

ITEM IN APPENDIX

15. USDA EXHIBIT. Extension of remarks of Sen. Gore commending the "Forge of Progress" exhibit demonstrating income-producing enterprises being carried on with the help of economic opportunity loans made available through Farmer's Home Administration, and inserting an article, "...Farmer Loans Paying Off." p. A1825

BILLS INTRODUCED

16. PERSONNEL. S. 1543 by Sen. Brewster, to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to prevent loss of annual leave by employees in certain cases; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

17. POVERTY. S. 1545 by Sen. Clark, to provide an improved charter for Economic Opportunity Act programs, to authorize funds for their continued operation, to expand summer camp opportunities for disadvantaged children; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Remarks of author pp. S5138-65

18. RECLAMATION. S. 1549 by Sen. Bennett, to authorize construction of the Little Dell Dam and Reservoir project, Salt Lake City, Utah; to Public Works Committee. Remarks of author pp. S5165-7

19. LOANS. S. 1550 by Sen. Ellender, to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide for release of valueless liens; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

PRINTED HEARING RECEIVED IN THIS OFFICE

20. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS. Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriations, 1968, part 1, budget for the Department of Agriculture, general agricultural outlook, and testimony of the Secretary. H. Appropriations Committee.

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS:
Apr. 17. Truth in lending, S. Banking and Currency; Redwood National Park, S. Int;
Apr. 18. Remove 5-acre limit on tobacco acreage, H. Agriculture (Godfrey to testify)
Apr. 24. Housing, H. Banking (Secretary Freeman to testify).

oOo

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 11, 1967
For actions of May 10, 1967
90th-1st; No. 73

CONTENTS

Air pollution.....17	Housing.....4,12	Research.....24
Biological program.....24	Imports.....20,25,26	Rice acreage.....6
Consumers.....15,18	Information.....3,16	Saline water.....7
Cosponsors.....14	Lands.....19	Selective service.....13
Credit.....8	Legislative program.....6	Taxation.....10,23
Dairy imports.....25	Loans.....22	Trade practices.....14
Demonstration cities.....4	Marketing.....20	Transportation.....9
Education.....21	Meat imports.....26	Truth in lending.....8
Food stamps.....1	Poverty.....5,11	Veterans.....13,22
Foreign trade.....20,25,26	Reclamation.....19	Wildlife.....2

HIGHLIGHTS: House Rules Committee cleared food stamp bill. Rep. Button introduced and discussed bill to regulate dairy imports. Rep. Ruppe introduced and discussed bill to regulate meat imports.

HOUSE

1. FOOD STAMPS. The "Daily Digest" states that the House Rules Committee "granted an open rule" for the consideration of H. R. 1318, the food stamp bill. p. D377

2. WILDLIFE. A subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 480, amended, relating to the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl, and to extend for an additional eight years the period during which funds may be appropriated, and H.R. 482, amended, relating to hunting stamps for the taking of migratory waterfowl

and to require a hunting stamp for the taking of any other migratory bird. p. D376

3. INFORMATION. Rep. Rumsfeld expressed concern over the "rumors that some agencies are resisting the changed requirements" necessary to conform with the freedom of information law and inserted an article, "U. S. Drafts Guidelines on Information Law." pp. H5301-2

4. HOUSING. Rep. Morse, Mass., commended Sen. Percy's "home ownership" bill and inserted the Senator's speech, "Urban Housing: A New Initiative." pp. H5304-5
Rep. Talcott criticized the demonstration cities program and inserted an article on the subject. pp. H5306-8

5. POVERTY. Rep. St Germain commended the war on poverty program and urged strong support for the program. p. H5320

6. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the House will on Thurs. consider the rice acreage allotment bill. p. D375

SENATE

7. SALINE WATER. Passed as reported H. R. 6133, authorizing funds for continuation of and expansion of the saline water conversion program. pp. S6592-3

8. TRUTH-IN-LENDING. Sen. Proxmire inserted the favorable report of the Justice Department on S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill. pp. S6616-7

9. WATER TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Mundt discussed and inserted an article on water transportation as a stimulant to more intensive regional development. pp. S6631-3

10. TAXATION. Sen. Bartlett discussed his reasons for voting "no" on the investment tax credit bill. p. S6636

11. POVERTY. Sen. Kennedy, Mass., commended the work of the OEO legal services program and stated, "For the first time many rural areas have access to legal assistance in civil matters." pp. S6641-2

12. HOUSING. Sen. Percy discussed the feasibility of providing homeownership for lower income families and inserted an article suggesting "use of condominium concept." pp. S6642-4

13. SELECTIVE SERVICE. Began debate on S. 1432, proposing several amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and adopted all committee amendments en bloc, with the provision they be treated as original text for purpose of further amendment. pp. S6662-76

14. COSPONSORS. Sens. Burdick, Church, Hart, Hickenlooper, McCarthy, Tydings, and Bayh were added as cosponsors to S. 109, to discourage unfair trade discrimination against members in farm organizations; Sen. Jordan, Idaho, was added as a cosponsor to S. 515, to prohibit desecreation of the American flag; and Sen. Murphy was added as cosponsor to S. 8161, to authorize construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colo. River Basin project. pp. S6612-3

APPALACHIA

Committee on Public Works: Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachia continued hearings on H.R. 4446, and related bills, to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. Testimony was heard from Gov. Hulett C. Smith, of West Virginia; Dr. Carruth Wagner, Director, Bureau of Health Services, U.S. Public Health Service; and public witnesses.

MENTAL HEALTH

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule providing for the consideration of and 2 hours of debate on H.R. 6431, to amend the public health laws relating to mental health to extend, expand, and improve them. Testimony was heard from Representatives Staggers and Springer.

FOOD STAMP ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule providing for the consideration of and 2 hours of debate, making it in order to consider the committee amendments without the intervention of any point of order, on H.R. 1318, to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. Testimony was heard from Representatives Sullivan, May, and Stubblefield.

APOLLO

Committee on Science and Astronautics: Subcommittee on NASA Oversight continued hearings on the Apollo 204 accident. Testimony was heard from James E. Webb, Administrator; and Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Deputy Administrator; both of NASA.

ESPIONAGE

Committee on Un-American Activities: Subcommittee continued hearings on the conduct of espionage within the U.S. by agents of foreign Communist governments. Testimony was heard from a public witness.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Committee on Ways and Means: Met in executive session and continued on H.R. 5710, to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system. No final action was taken.

Joint Committee Meetings

RADIATION EXPOSURE

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation continued hearings to receive testimony concerning programs to solve problems of radiation exposure of uranium miners, having as its witnesses Dr. Leo J. Gehrig, Acting Surgeon General, Public Health Service; and James T. Ramey, member, Atomic Energy Commission.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Joint Economic Committee: Subcommittee on Economy in Government continued its series of hearings to explore the effectiveness of governmental management of numerous common functions of civilian and military establishments, receiving testimony from Martin R. Gainsbrugh, Chief Economist, National Industrial Conference Board; and R. Douglas Marshall, National Association of Wholesalers.

Hearings continue on Tuesday, May 16.

BILL SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

New Law

(*For last listing of public laws, see* DIGEST, *p. D371, May 9, 1967*)

S. 303, to increase authorizations for the civil government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Signed May 10, 1967 (P.L. 90–16).

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 11

(*All meetings are open unless otherwise designated*)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation, on S. 109, prohibiting discrimination against agricultural producer concerning his right to belong to an association of producers, 10 a.m., 324 Old Senate Office Building.

Committee on Armed Services, Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, executive, on pilot training, requirements, and inventories, to hear Maj. Gen. Robert R. Williams, Director of Army Aviation, 10 a.m., 224 Old Senate Office Building.

Committee on Appropriations, subcommittee, on H.R. 9481, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1967, 10 a.m., room S–128, Capitol.

Subcommittee, on fiscal 1968 budget estimates for public works, 10 a.m. and 2 p.m., 1114 New Senate Office Building.

Subcommittee, on fiscal 1968 budget estimates for the Department of Agriculture, and related agencies, 10 a.m., 1318 New Senate Office Building.

Subcommittee, on H.R. 8569, D.C. appropriations, 10 a.m., room S–126, Capitol.

Committee on the District of Columbia, Public Health Subcommittee, on S. 767, licensing of doctors in the D.C.; S. 1224, requiring a register of blind persons in the D.C.; and S. 1452, re D.C. minimum wages, 2:30 p.m., 6226 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Government Research, to continue hearings on distribution of Government research funds, 10 a.m., 3302 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, on S. 915, to establish a Federal Judicial Center to conduct training programs for personnel in the judicial branch of Government, 9:30 a.m., 6226 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Labor, to continue hearings on S.J. Res. 81, providing for settlement of the railway labor dispute, to hear Secretary of Transportation Boyd, 10 a.m., 4232 New Senate Office Building.

Next meeting of the SENATE
12:00 noon, Thursday, May 11

Next meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12:00 noon, Thursday, May 11

House

Committee on Agriculture, executive, to continue on H.R. 1400, and related bills, providing for additional sources of financing for rural electrification and rural telephone programs, 10 a.m., 1301 Longworth House Office Building.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense, executive, 10 a.m., H–140 U.S. Capitol Building.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, executive, 1 p.m., B–305 Rayburn House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, executive, 1 p.m., H–309 U.S. Capitol Building.

Committee on Armed Services, to continue hearings on extension of induction provisions of the Universal Military Service and Training Act, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn House Office Building.

Committee on the District of Columbia, to hold a hearing on various revenue bills, 10:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth House Office Building.

Committee on Education and Labor, Select Subcommittee on Education, to continue hearings on H.R. 4261, and related bills, to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions, 9:45 a.m., 2261 Rayburn House Office Building.

General Subcommittee on Labor, to continue hearings on H.R. 478, to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas; and H.R. 479, to require the Secretary of Labor to investigate the effect of foreign competition on domestic employment when a complaint is filed by an employer or labor organization, 9:45 a.m., 2257 Rayburn House Office Building.

General Subcommittee on Education, to continue hearings on H.R. 7642, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967, 9:45 a.m., 2175 Rayburn House Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, to continue hearings on H.R. 7099, to further amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, executive, for a briefing on inter-American affairs, 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn House Office Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, to continue hearings on H.R. 170, and related bills, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Constellation National Historic Site in the State of Maryland, 9:45 a.m., 1324 Longworth House Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to continue hearings on H.J. Res. 559, to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn House Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 1, to hold a hearing on private immigration bills, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 2, to hold a hearing on private claims bills, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 3, to continue hearings on H.R. 5924, for the general revision of the patent laws, title 35, U.S.C., 10 a.m., 2226 Rayburn House Office Building.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation, to hold a hearing on H.R. 168, to amend the act of June 20, 1918, relating to the retirement age requirements of certain personnel of the Coast Guard; H.R. 169, and related bills, to increase the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service, and thereafter to provide for cost-of-living increases in benefits payable to such widows and to such former employees; H.R. 2193, to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Eugenie II,* owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; H.R. 7043, to authorize and direct the Secretary of the department under which the U.S. Coast Guard is operating to cause the vessel *Northwind,* owned by Wallace P. Smith, Jr., of Centreville, Md., to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges; and H.R. 6775, to permit the vessel steamship *Bedloe* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade while it is owned by Guarisco Enterprises, Inc., 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth House Office Building.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Subcommittee on Position Classification, to continue hearings on H.R. 7, and related bills, to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, 10 a.m., 356 Cannon House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Postal Rates, to continue hearings on H.R. 4424, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces (to be followed by an executive session), 10 a.m., 346 Cannon House Office Building.

Committee on Public Works, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachia, to continue hearings on H.R. 4446, and related bills, to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn House Office Building.

Committee on Science and Astronautics, Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, executive, to continue consideration on H.R. 6470, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn House Office Building.

Committee on Ways and Means, executive, to continue on H.R. 5710, to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, 10 a.m., committee room, Longworth House Office Building.

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶ The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

May 11, 1967

12. FOOD SHORTAGE. Sen. Gruening spoke in favor of his bill S. 1503, to provide funds to deal with the world population crisis in light of the increasing food shortage and inserted several articles supporting his position. pp. S6720-3

13. POVERTY. Sen. Ervin criticized an OEO project in N. C. to operate a weekly newspaper and radio broadcast system and inserted several articles in opposition to this project. pp. S6727-33

14. NOMINATION. Received the nomination of Dr. Walter W. Wilcox to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation. p. S6784

15. FOREST FIRES. Report from OEP on forest and grass fires was referred to Public Works Committee, and ordered to be printed as a Senate document. p. S6783

16. REORGANIZATION. The Government Operations Committee reported favorably S. Res. 114, to disapprove the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2, which would transfer certain administrative duties from the Tariff Commission to its Chairman (S. Rept. 226). p. S6685

17. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 15, when it will consider S. 1031, Peace Corps authorizations; H. R. 9481, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1967; and H. R. 9020, Interior appropriations for fiscal year 1968. pp. S6783-4

HOUSE

18. RICE ACREAGE. Passed as reported H. J. Res. 263, establishing farm rice acreage allotments for certain producers and farms (pp. H5337-41). This bill "would enable persons who acquired, for the purpose of producing rice, land suitable for the production of rice prior to 1955, but who did not produce rice on this land during the period 1950 through 1954 due to being in the military service during such period, to obtain a producer rice allotment allocated to the farm, or a farm rice acreage allotment, of sufficient size to constitute an economic rice operation. The allotment acreage required for this purpose would be allocated from the national acreage reserve...House Joint Resolution 263 would not decrease the allotment of any other rice producer."

19. TAXATION. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 6950, to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property (p. H5329). Senate conferees have already been appointed.

20. FOOD STAMPS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 1318, the food stamp bill. p. H5402

Reps. Olsen and Everett expressed concern over a committee amendment to the food stamp bill which would require "20 percent financial participation by the States." pp. H5344, H5398-9

Rep. Whitten refuted a statement in an article that "as the 'holder of the purse strings of the Department of Agriculture,' I had blocked funds for food stamps needed by the poor to buy Government subsidized food; and that 'Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has phoned Whitten repeatedly, pleading with him to approve the necessary funds.'" pp. H5344-5

21. WATERSHEDS. Received from this Department plans for works of improvement on various watershed projects. p. H5401

22. WATER RESOURCES. Received from Interior a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. H5401

23. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee was given until midnight, May 12, to file a privileged report on the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bills. p. H5327

24. LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION. Rep. Rhodes, Ariz., discussed the provisions contained in S. 355, the proposed Legislative Reorganization Act, and urged action on the bill. pp. H5352-3

25. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Button expressed the belief "that our negotiators in Geneva are retreating from the strong position absolutely necessary to provide a sound, broad-based trade future for American agriculture," and inserted a Wall Street Journal article on the subject. pp. H5353-4

26. HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION. Rep. Resnick stated that the highway beautification program is in "grave danger" and inserted several editorials dealing with "the need for highway beautification legislation." pp. H5384-5

27. COOPERATIVES. Rep. Scheuer applauded the "decision of the Office of Economic Opportunity to fund the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association." p. H5399

28. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert stated that on Mon. the House will begin debate on the food stamp bill, which is expected to be completed on Wed., and on Tues. and Wed. the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill will be taken up. pp. H5363-4

29. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 15. p. H5401

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

30. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Schadeberg stating that "America's dairy farmer, and the farmer in general, has been suffering financial setbacks in recent years", and inserting an article on problems of milk marketing. p. A2324

31. APPALACHIA. Rep. Williams of Pa., inserted Gov. Shafer's testimony supporting extension of the Appalachian program. pp. A2330-1

32. TRUTH IN LENDING. Rep. Laird inserted a Wisc. Legislature resolution opposing the proposed truth in lending bill. p. A2333

33. FOOD STAMPS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Fraser stating that Minnesotans can attest to the value of the food stamp program. p. A2348

34. RECREATION. Rep. Reuss inserted Secretary Freeman's speech on the Nation's growing demand for outdoor recreation facilities. pp. A2348-50

35. FOOD FOR INDIA. Rep. Fulton, Pa., inserted an American Embassy, New Delhi, background paper, "Can India Feed Itself By 1971?" pp. A2350-2

90TH CONGRESS
1st Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
No. 257

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1318

MAY 11, 1967.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 471]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 471, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



65-008

House Calendar No. 54

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 471

[Report No. 257]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 11, 1967

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1318) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider

without the intervention of any point of order the amendments recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

House Calendar No. 54

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 471

[Report No. 257]

RESOLUTION

Providing for consideration of H.R. 1318, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

By Mr. BOLLING

MAY 11, 1967

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

my judgment, cost coverage in second and third class is substantially below levels that can be justified on grounds of deferred service or national benefit.

Each time the need for rate increases was evident in the past, Congress thoroughly explored the ability of patrons to pay higher rates. And each time the users of second and third class mail carefully prepared their arguments against higher rates. As a result, when doubts arose concerning ability to pay they were usually resolved in favor of more moderate rate increases.

In 1961, the representatives of the magazine publishing industry appeared before the Congress and supported their fight against higher rates with a report prepared by a nationally prominent accounting firm. It warned that America's magazine industry was "in a precarious financial position." That and similar warnings had a significant effect on the final decision to enact a moderate postal rate increase phased over a 3-year period. According to magazine industry spokesmen, however, their financial situation has since changed from insecure to solid, a fact that may encourage the Congress to enact another increase to defray a small part of a total $400 million revenue deficiency traceable to second class mail before excluding public service costs.

For example, the *Magazine Industry Newsletter,* dated December 31, 1966, reported the following, in part:

"1966 will mark the biggest year in magazine advertising revenue—also in circulation.

"Magazine advertising revenue for 1966 was estimated at $1,160,000,000 . . . a 7% increase over last year's revenue figure . . .

"Magazine circulation is increasing *faster* than the growth of the U.S. adult population . . .

"Publishers look optimistically forward to 1967."

In view of these reports of publishers' affluence, in sharp contrast with deepening postal deficits, we ask the Congress to approve an average 23 percent increase for regular-rate, outside-the-country mailings of second class publications. This would be phased over a three-year period.

For commercial mailings of bulk-rate third-class matter, the increase approved in 1962 was even more moderate than for second class: only 15 percent phased over a 3-year period. Cost coverage is still only about 60 percent and we are recommending an average increase of 31 percent. We would recommend a larger increase were it not for expected cost savings. Over the next few years, the cost of handling bulk mail will be reduced as we move into full-scale ZIP Code presorting. These innovations and the proposed rate increases should bring third class mail much closer to full cost coverage.

Bulk-rate third-class mail has been the most rapidly growing of all major mail services. From 1947 to 1966 its volume increased more than 250 percent, at a time when all other mail increased only 80 percent. Even in the period from 1953 to 1966, when most rate increases were effective, bulk mail rose 73 percent.

There is no doubt that low postage rates have contributed to the extraordinary growth of direct mail. Also, there is abundant evidence that the rate increases enacted in 1951, 1958 and in 1962 have not disadvantaged either the direct mail industry or the users of that advertising service. Since 1950, bulk-mail volume has grown faster than our economy. Moreover, according to recent business reports, direct mail volume has held its 15-percent share of the nation's advertising dollar despite higher postage costs and despite hard driving competition from television, radio, and magazine advertising.

At one time, low direct mail postage was defended on grounds that volume expansion was desirable to fill Post Office workload gaps. Perhaps that was a valid defense of low postage in the early 1930's when all postal volume was only a third of today's volume. Perhaps it was still valid in the early years after World War II, say 1947, when bulk mail was only 13 percent of all mail volume. But today it is nearly one-fourth of all mail volume. With total workload increases of three to four billion pieces of mail each year, we have no "slack-hour" problems.

I found of considerable interest a recent article highly favorable to direct mail. It appeared in the January issue of *Postal Record,* the official publication of the National Association of Letter Carriers. That article reported:

"If there were no third class mail, the Post Office Department could eliminate about one-quarter of its clerical employees, and about one-fifth of its letter carriers."

Well, the cost of keeping that number of employees on our payrolls is about $780 million annually. In contrast, our total revenue from third class mail is only $682 million. So, right off, we have an out-of-pocket loss of nearly $100 million in just two personnel categories, to say nothing of the added costs for other personnel, transportation, space and equipment.

We certainly do not object to the rapid growth of third class mail. We welcome it as a sign of economic growth. However, we do object when that growth adds considerably more to our costs than to postal revenues. We object, too, when the growth of bulk mail adds to the burdens of other mail users and taxpayers who must pay the costs of rapidly mounting postal deficits. I should also like to stress that we recognize and applaud the effort made by second and third class bulk mailers to comply with ZIP Code pre-sort regulations. This effort has resulted in some costs to these mailers and we have recognized this burden by requesting that the new second and third class bulk mail rates be delayed until January 1, 1968.

I might also add that had it not been for the anticipated savings through the pre-sort program for bulk mail, it would have been necessary to request considerably higher rates on bulk second and third-class mail.

Mr. Chairman, our proposals also call for increases in the rates paid by nonprofit organizations. Percentagewise, these rate increases would be steeper than other increases, but only because the rates are initially so low. Even with the proposed increases such organizations would still maintain large and valuable postage preferences. Currently, the public service cost of handling nonprofit mail exceeds $200 million yearly—nearly 40 percent of all public service costs.

About two years ago the Department's Advisory Panel on Postal Rates—a distinguished group of citizens—recommended that special rates for nonprofit organizations be discontinued. The one dissenting voice came from a member who represented one of those organizations. While our proposals fall far short of the position advocated by the Advisory Panel, we believe more-than-average increases are justifiable.

Today, up to eight publications can be mailed by these organizations for a little as one penny. And there is no extra charge for longer hauls. For that penny, the Post Office will accept these eight publications in New York and deliver them in Hawaii.

Also, without regard to length of haul, the Post Office will deliver four fund-solicitation letters for just one nickel.

Neither of these minimum rates for nonprofit organizations, in second or third class, was raised in 1962 when all other rates were raised.

We are also recommending a new postage principle for nonprofit publications that carry more than 10 percent advertising. There will be a moderately higher rate scaled upward in proportion to the volume of advertising carried by these publications. This is essentially the same postage principle that has long been applied by the Congress for commercial publications. However, we are not proposing equal postage treatment for both types of advertising. Nonprofit organizations would continue to get huge postage concessions.

Mr. Chairman, I have great appreciation for the work of our nonprofit organizations. But I cannot in good conscience ask for an $800-million postage increase and not ask for some reduction in the more-than-$200-million public service cost generated by these organizations. It must be recognized, this cost is in addition to the tax concessions which these nonprofit organizations enjoy. But, unlike tax concessions—which represent revenue foregone by the Federal Treasury—postal public service costs are direct subsidies financed by those who *must* pay taxes.

Before I conclude my statement, I particularly want to urge approval of a section of this bill that will help the Department move faster toward a modern and improved postal service. We ask that the Department be given authority to charge an extra unit of postage—6 cents or 9 cents—for lightweight first class or air mail pieces in hard-to-handle sizes. The proposed surcharge would be limited to mail weighing not more than two ounces and it would not go into effect sooner than two years after enactment.

To meet similar objectives in third class mail we are proposing three adidtional changes:

1. Samples of merchandise in non-standard, hard-to-handle sizes would not be eligible for bulk-rate postage.

2. When mailed in quantities at the higher, single-piece third-class rates, merchandise samples would be accepted for mailing only when pre-sorted or prepared as prescribed by the Department.

3. In addition to the changes regarding samples, all other non-standard-size third-class mail would be subject to higher minimum postage rates.

Rather than collect extra postage for non-standard envelopes and other hard-to-handle mail, we would much prefer to see their use greatly reduced. Unless we curtail the myriad envelope sizes and shapes, we must plan a more costly and slower postal modernization program. And if their use is not curtailed, we would at least be paid some of the extra handling costs.

I have not tried to cite all the details of a far-reaching bill that touches all except parcel post and international mails. New parcel post rates and size-weight reform were enacted by the Congress last September. Anticipating the full financial effects of that legislation, we are at about a break-even point in that service. Higher international postage rates were proposed on January 14 and new rates were put into effect on May 1, restoring a break-even operation.

We are now asking the Congress to take up the very important remaining problems of rate adjustment. It is a difficult set of problems. Nevertheless, we believe action must be taken soon so that Congress may in the future concern itself primarily with postal modernization and service improvement rather than the day-to-day operating deficits of the postal system.

Mr. Chairman, in his special message to the Congress on April 5, 1967, the President urged postal rate increases for the reasons I cited and to cover proposed pay increases for postal workers. Before I conclude my statement, I want to underscore the need for rate action to meet the cost of paying higher salaries to our worthy postal employees, increased pay to which I feel they are strongly entitled. The Administration and the Congress have made a commitment to maintain Federal employee salaries on par with those paid in private industry. That has been our

goal ever since the Federal Salary Reform Act was passed in 1962.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, the rate increases we proposed are the very least we can have to operate a viable, progressive mail service.

The American people are entitled to no less than the finest mail service in the world. I believe that the intensified effort to move ahead through research, and through mechanization and modernization, all geared to improving the working conditions of our employees, will bring us to the threshold of a new era in our postal history. My dream of the postal service of the future is one that I am sure that I share with every Member of this Committee: a postal service that operates at the very minimum cost and at the maximum efficiency, a postal service of which we can all be proud. I believe this new rate structure is a significant element in the fulfillment of that dream.

THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the legislative authorization for the food stamp program and its current appropriation expire on June 30, 1967.

Since coming to the Congress in 1961, I have supported the food stamp program and I intend to give it my full support again this year. However, I have some strong reservations about the proposed changes in the cost-sharing formula asked for in the new legislation—H.R. 1318—as reported from the House Committee on Agriculture, April 12, 1967.

I can speak about these proposed changes from a knowledge of firsthand experience gained over the 7 years that this program has been assisting in providing better nutrition for the less fortunate in Montana's First Congressional District. It has been my privilege to work with local officials in bringing this program to Montana and consulting with them to work out problems when it was in its early stages. Through our joint efforts, Silver Bow County was selected back in 1961 as one of the original pilot counties in which the food stamp program was tested and developed. Subsequently, Deer Lodge County installed the program and two others, Glacier and Lincoln, have requested the program.

Basically the food stamp program increases food-purchasing power for households whose current income is insufficient to buy the food necessary to meet the minimal needs of the family unit. Under the program low-income families take the amount of money they normally spend on food and purchase food coupons of greater value to meet their minimum food needs. The amount of gain in food-purchasing power is determined by income, need, and assets, but the average national gain is about one-third. The coupons can then be spent for food in regular grocery stores.

One most important aspect of this program is that it does not replace the amount of money that is normally spent on food. It can only increase that amount by adding to it. It is a voluntary program specifically designed to aid only those families who need and desire enough food to provide adequate meals.

Because the food stamp program increases food-purchasing power, it likewise expands the national market for agricultural products. All of the studies done have shown significant increases in food consumption. Of special interest to the State of Montana is the 24-percent increase in the consumption of grain products shown in the Detroit study of the effectiveness of the stamp program. Milk, fruit, and vegetable consumption were also up sharply.

The program is closely supervised and operates very smoothly. I am proud to be able to report that of the 171 retail and wholesale grocery outlets in the State of Montana cooperating in this program, there has never been cause for disqualification of a single place of business. From the standpoint of individual participation, the program, for all practical purposes, has been abuse-free.

This program is doing the job it was designed to do in the State of Montana. It is bringing better meals to people who need them. It is utilizing the normal retail channels of distribution and the regular State administrative machinery. It is operating both effectively and efficiently.

Under the present program the State pays almost the entire cost of getting the food coupons to the families. The State administers the program, selects the participants and pays the cost of selling the coupons to the individuals. The Federal Government pays the difference between what the participant pays and the value of the coupons he receives. In addition, the Federal Government pays the cost of supervising the stores that are cooperating and they assume the national administrative costs.

The measure now under consideration will radically change this. It would require that the State of Montana, beginning in July of 1969, pay 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons in addition to its present administrative expenses. Presently State expenses run about 7 percent of the value of these bonus coupons. The new proposal would increase this cost to 27 percent.

At the present time, three counties in Montana have the program—two have requested it. If all five of these counties were operating in the program now it is estimated that 6,912 individuals would be assisted and the value of the bonus coupons would be about $501,892 per year.

Given this participation under the present cost-sharing formula, the program cost to the State of Montana would be approximately $35,000. Under the proposed formula, Montana's cost would jump to approximately $135,000. This is almost a fourfold increase over the present formula cost.

The point is made that this cost increase is necessary to control the program externally from rampant expansion and internally to prevent looseness of administration by the States. First of all there has been no rampant growth. There are 57 counties in the State of Montana and only five have applied for the program since it has been operating nationally. In other words, present program costs are sufficient deterrent except where the assistance is clearly needed. There has been no looseness of administration. Standards for participation within a State must be the State's own assistance standards and for those outside the assistance program standards must be closely related to the existing welfare standards. In Montana this means that a family of four earning $139.99 per month must spend $52 to receive $84 in food stamps. This is no steak and caviar diet in Montana by any stretch of the food budget. However, with sound planning, this family can have some meat and some vegetables and some fruit in its meals that it could otherwise not afford. They can, if they are prudent, have meals which provide the minimum nutrients necessary to good health and well-being. This program is in no way excessive and there has been no demonstrated need to raise the cost of this program to prevent invented abuses.

I will oppose the cost increase to States on the basis that it is unwarranted by program experience. The increase in cost will price the program out of reach of the States. This will be especially true in the less wealthy States where the need is the greatest. The severe reduction in program participation following this price increase would serve to contract the market for agricultural products. If we are going to assist in bringing the less fortunate in our Nation better diets the bill is going to have to be paid either at the Federal or the State and local level. I believe the Federal Government can more equitably pro-rate this cost on a national level.

It is unthinkable that in this land of agricultural abundance we have children and elderly getting up hungry and going to bed hungry. We have devised a simple, effective method of coping with this problem that stimulates self-reliance, utilizes our agricultural ability through the private enterprise system and enhances Federal-State relationships.

There is absolutely no reason to take this fine program—which I am satisfied is doing all that we intended it to do when we passed it in 1964—and put a price tag on it which the individual States cannot afford to pay.

LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 9, this week, a national columnist, in a syndicated column carried by many newspapers throughout the country, accused me of blocking food for Mississippi Negroes.

Mr. Speaker, my name is spelled right and I am "bespectacled," and perhaps at times I have been stubborn, which can be to one's credit at times; but other than that, there is not a single statement concerning me in the article that is true.

The article says:

Despite a Senate finding of "wide spread hunger" in the Delta Counties that can only be described as shocking.

There was no such Senate finding.

There was such a statement attributed to two U.S. Senators from New York, one

each from Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Vermont, and California.

Mr. Speaker, the writer said that as the "holder of the purse strings of the Department of Agriculture," I had blocked funds for food stamps needed by the poor to buy Government subsidized food; and that "Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has phoned Whitten repeatedly, pleading with him to approve the necessary funds."

Mr. Speaker, for the present fiscal year, on my recommendation, the Congress provided $140,000,000 for food stamps. That money, or approximately $59,000,000 remaining as of March 31, the latest reporting date, is in Secretary Freeman's hands, not mine.

The Secretary was disturbed at the statements attributed to these Senators. However, Orville Freeman is not one to beg nor plead. He and I have maintained a relationship of mutual respect and can talk about mutual problems at any time. We talked about this one.

I pointed out to him that the law required him to sell food stamps, and set up a formula for charges; that I did not believe there was any such general situation in my State, but if, as the Senators claimed, there were families in such condition, the answer was welfare. The Department of Agriculture supplied me with the names and addresses. I immediately called the Public Welfare Director of my State, gave her full information on each family and asked that she have her people check the situation of these families and make proper provision for them. This she is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I know you and other Members are aware of the fact that this fiscal year I recommended and the committee and the Congress approved $27,855,000 more for the school lunch program than Secretary Freeman recommended; and $83,000,000 more for the school milk program, though I hasten to say it was the Bureau of the Budget rather than the Secretary which was responsible for the reduced figures.

Mr. Speaker, the Department has on hand now approximately $50,000,000 in food stamp funds and says it will carry over a substantial sum into next year.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to cities of New York State, California, Michigan, West Virginia, Massachusetts. I am familiar with conditions in the slum areas of many of them. We have tried to help. Our committee, in addition to providing funds for school lunch, school milk, and food stamps, financed studies of food distribution facilities and provided plans for food markets for New York City, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, which have been of great assistance to those cities and their people.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues are familiar with these facts and though I have received only a very few letters following the publication of this column, no one likes to be accused of hurting people. I dislike such charges, especially since from my district attorney days to date I have tried to be fair to all people, regardless of race and regardless of the section of the country in which they live. I have followed such a course here, both as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Agriculture and as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works.

Mr. Speaker, this column brings to mind the statement of my late chairman, Hon. Clarence Cannon, who on a similar occasion had this to say, and I quote:

Now a word about Drew Pearson. Mr. Speaker, I regard him as an indispensable adjunct of our de facto government. He has become an American institution. In the language of the English Parliament he would be denominated as "Her Majesty's Opposition." In ecclesiasticai parlance he would be termed "The Devil's Advocate." Of course, a man who must write a column every day of the year must at times embeilish prosaic annals of uneventful days with a little sensationaiism in order to make them readabie. But he arouses interest and sometimes throws the needed light of publicity on otherwise unnoted phases of American life and consequently is always entertaining. I take off my hat to him. And I hereby express admiration of the very efficient job he did on me.

In the ianguage of Rip Van Winkle, May he, in the risibie camaraderie of Mark Twain, Josh Billings and the Baron Munchausen, live long and prosper.

NO EVASION OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT UNDER THE QUIE BILL

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the Quie substitute to the pending elementary and secondary education bill, H.R. 8983, should give no comfort to those who seek certain routes for southern school districts to prevent desegregation. It is unseemly that, in order to obtain support for this substitute, certain claims are being made that it undermines Federal enforcement under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I make this point because supporters of the Quie amendment are attempting to make this proposal all things to all men.

I am sure that the House of Representatives will soon join in rejecting the Quie substitute because of its many obvious defects. The appeals to southern regional interests is spurious.

To make certain that the facts are as I state them, I wrote to the Attorney General on May 2, 1967, asking for official information as to the relationship of Representative QUIE's proposal to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and to Federal enforcement under that act. The text of my letter to the Attorney General and his reply follow:

MAY 2, 1967.

Hon. RAMSEY CLARK,
Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The House of Representatives will soon begin floor debate on certain proposed amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. On April 11, 1967, the Committee on Education and Labor reported favorably, as amended by the Committee, H.R. 7819, the "Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967." Under this bill, the basic structure of the 1965 Act—federal financial assistance for specific purposes as described in different Titles of the Act—would be preserved.

Representative Quie of Minnesota has introduced H.R. 8983, the "Elementary and Secondary Block Grants Amendment Act of 1967," which incorporates a different approach. This bill would add a new Title VII to the 1965 Education Act, under which the Commissioner of Education would be authorized to make "block" grants to the States. The bill provides that " . . . it is the intent of Congress that these (Title VII) grants will replace those authorized under Titles I, II, III and V of . . . " the 1965 Act. Unlike grants presently being made under the 1965 Act, the proposed Title VII grants could be used by the States for a wide variety of educational purposes, subject to certain limitations set forth in the bill. The text of the most recent revised version of H.R. 8983 is set forth at pages 4676–4678 of Volume 113 of the Congressional Record (daily ed.).

I would like to have your views on the following questions: First, would Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 apply to H.R. 8983? Second, if Title VI would apply, would enactment of H.R. 8983 affect enforcement of Title VI?

Sincereiy,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

MAY 3, 1967.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: This is in response to your ietter of May 2, 1967 conerning H.R. 8983 the "Eiementary and Secondary Block Grants Amendment Act of 1967," and the relationship of that proposai to Titie VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. You asked whether Title VI would apply to H.R. 8983 and, if so, whether enactment of that bill would affect enforcement of Title VI.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on account of race, color, or national origin in any program or activity receiving federai financial assistance by way of grant. Thus, it is clear that Title VI would apply to H.R. 8983, just as Titie VI now applies to grants under the Elementary and Secretary Education Act of 1965, the statute which H.R. 8983 would amend.

Enactment of H.R. 8983 would not affect enforcement of Title VI of the 1964 Act. Grants under Titie I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are administered pursuant to a state plan submitted to HEW by state educational authorities. As a condition of eligibility for federai financial assistance under such a grant program, the state agency as well as iocal schooi districts are required to file with HEW an assurance that the program will be conducted in conformity with Titie VI and the HEW Regulation. This assurance requirement would be equaliy appiicable to "block" grants under Title VII of H.R. 8983, under which payments would be made by HEW to state educational authorities and, in turn, distributed by the state authorities to iocai schooi districts. Generaily, the same procedures and sanctions now applicable under Titie VI to individuai school districts (inciuding possible termination of funds to such districts) would appiy to those districts receiving funds under H.R. 8983.

Moreover, under the present enforcement program, the refusai of a state agency to file the required assurance of compiiance or to abide by its terms would authorize HEW to initiate administrative proceedings to terminate or to refuse to continue assistance to the entire State program. This occurred when the Alabama State Welfare agency refused to submit such an assurance for its statewide welfare program, and that order is currently being judiciaiiy reviewed.

Congressman Quie, the sponsor of H.R. 8983, recognized that Title VI would appiy

to that bill and that enforcement of Title VI would not be affected by its enactment. Congressman Quie recently answered a series of questions concerning H.R. 8983, saying that—

Fifth. Would your amendment in any way affect enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act?

Absolutely not. The Civil Rights Act would apply to these grants under a State plan in exactly the same way as it applies to all other Federal grants for education, most of which are administered through a State plan. 113 Cong. Rec. 4430 (daily ed).

Sincerely,

———— ————,

Attorney General.

OH MY COUNTRY

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1967, there appeared on the front page of the very well-known French newspaper Le Figaro an article by Pierre Daninos, a famous French author. I would like to read a paragraph from the article, which I have had translated, and which I shall put in the RECORD. He is speaking of a Frenchman to France and some Frenchmen. He said:

Oh my beloved country, champion of the logic and the common sense, you who call the Americans big children but behave like an uneducated youngster, you who say.

"I have two countries—mine and France," and shout in the evening: "France for the French," you who yesterday kissed the tanks that brought you freedom and you who then urged the last U.S. soldiers to prudently camouflage their license numbers, you who pose as a peace dove and whose arms only inadvertently penetrated into Algiers and Sargossa. . . . you who claim to be the most courteous people on earth but you. . . . cross the sidewalk in order not to greet the Duke of Edinburgh, you who brandish the banner of brotherhood but forgot to get to Vimy to honor the memory of the 60,000 Canadians who for the sake of your beautiful eyes closed theirs forever, you who consider it normal that your President order the United States to withdraw unconditionally from Vietnam but who would have found it intolerable had the White House suggested to you the same order at the height of the war in Algeria—I like you but you do act like a chameleon.

This is from a Frenchman to the French, and I commend the entire article as worthy of the few minutes it will take for every Member to read it. The entire article is as follows:

OH MY COUNTRY

(By Pierre Daninos)

After having given a short lecture to the German NATO officers, Mr. Alfred Grosser, director of studies at the Political Science Foundation, said to one of them: "I guess there should not be any inconveniences now to walk around in Paris in uniform?" "No, we do not have any," was the smiling reply, "but I bet that our American friends could not say the same."

This mark of our upside down world in which France, as it is right and proper, has its head in a whirl, became evident to me in the mail I received after the publication of an article which showed the absurdity of a certain anti-Americanism in a country that has been Americanizing itself for its own pleasure. A copious mail always reflects, like a barometer, the ups and downs of the public mood: six months before 30% of the letters would have been strong; now there were only three out of five hundred which were violent and I was surprised to learn that they called me "courageous". I, perhaps, had displayed some courage in Dunkirk or Maloles-Bains, and probably quite unintentionally, as I do not consider war a test nor do I believe that having been catapulted into Dunkirk or Verdun was something of a glory; many are there and will stay there because they have no other choice. But does it mean that one has lost the concepts of valor and honor when one calls the man courageous who did freely express his opinion in a free newspaper?

If I now revert to the topic then I do it on account of recent events and because of a photo in the New York Times which I received while I was on a trip and which hit me smack in the eye like a splash from the Torrey Canyon: a picture showing the American flag being burned by foolhardy youngsters who were defending the Vietnamese at Place d'Iéna by setting fire to the fifty stars (did I not see such swashbucklers who shouted for an independent Algeria at Saint-Germain-des-Prés or others who were fighting the Nazi tyranny in Rio [de Janeiro] by sounding their horns to the tunes of the Marseillaise). Undoubtedly, these youngsters who were not born under Hitler had no idea that what they were burning, we, not so long ago, had been dying to see come to us. But would they have shown as much passion for the fire if one had not started striking the match at an important place? It is easy for certain persons to recall what was done in 1776 as if the blood of Lafayette was flowing in their veins. My memory, however, is shorter and more faithful. It reminds me and will always remind me that if the English, the Canadians, and the Americans had not crushed together with the Russians the Nazi Hydra, Paris which has been burning after "Is Paris Burning?" would have a gauleiter [regional leader of NSDAP] as its master.

May one talk in this manner without being accused of deliriously loving America? Do people believe that I have been oblivious of the American blunders or the cruelty of the bombings in Vietnam? But should I be in a better position than the Pentagon to determine the course of those lines where force has to be applied although they often are not in agreement with those dictated by our hearts? Should we believe that thousands of young men are sent to Asia just for the pleasure and in disregard of their mothers' sorrows? As a citizen of the free world who, I admit, feels himself more attracted to the Anglo-Saxon democracies than to the big Marxist-Leninist brain washing machines, should I raise another voice than that of a friend to a friend who has gone astray on the wrong path? As to our "committed" weeklies could they speak as freely if the American flag flying in Berlin would not allow them to judge ex-Lutetia and very calmly Johnson, Nasser or "K"?

Oh my beloved country, champion of the logic and the common sense, you who call the Americans big children but behave like an uneducated youngster, you who say that the Italians are versatile and the Russians always ready to turn around their coats, you whom in a half century I have seen successively turn sky blue and red, Germanophobe and Germanophile, Anglophile and Anglophobe, Pétainist and Gaullist, determined to fight it to the very end and willing to surrender, lick the Vietnamese and dress yourself as a Red Guard—you, sweet country, who adore being wakened by the whisper: "I have two countries—mine and France," and shout in the evening: "France for the French," you who yesterday kissed the tanks that brought you freedom and you who then urged the last U.S. soldiers to prudently camouflage their license numbers, you who pose as a peace dove and whose arms only inadvertently penetrated into Algiers and Saragossa, you the little Cartesian who because you did not want to vote Gaullist changed from the extreme right one Sunday to Communist on the following, you who claim to be the most courteous people on earth but you, swift-footed Perrichon cross the sidewalk in order not to greet the Duke of Edinburgh, you who brandish the banner of brotherhood but forget to go to Vimy to honor the memory of the 60,000 Canadians who for the sake of your beautiful eyes closed theirs forever, you who consider it normal that your President order the United States to withdraw unconditionally from Vietnam but who would have found it intolerable had the White House suggested to you the same order at the height of the war in Algeria—I like you but you do act like a chameleon.

WHAT IS THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES POSITION ON COMMUNISM?

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the expressions of some who claim to speak for Christianity are irreconcilable to the pure at heart. Some seem more intent at converting Christians to heathenism than following the Master's command to save the unbeliever and the lost.

What good can come of Christian ministers who permit themselves to become so antireligious and exploited that they are denounced as traitors and false leaders? They are not only disloyal to America, but disobedient to Christ.

Are they builders or destroyers? If the latter, they are a disgrace to their calling and a scourge to their country and people.

The Bible and 1967 years of concerted effort by dedicated believers will not be overcome by a handful of puny "anti's."

Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent that the editorial from the April 29, 1967, Baton Rouge State Times and the article entitled, "Is the NCC Really Soft on Communism?" by David A. Noebel be here inserted in the RECORD for study by those interested and concerned. The articles are as follows:

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State Times, Apr. 29, 1967]

NOT THE VOICE OF AMERICA

The Rev. Dr. Eugene Carson Blake may speak with the voice of the World Council of Churches but he does not speak with the voice of America when he urges that this nation accept any kind of peace it can get out of the Vietnam conflict.

Peace at any price is not an American tenet.

Dr. Blake is general secretary of the World Council of Churches and he is, short of treasonous utterances when his country is at war to all intents and purposes, certainly entitled to express his views.

It is not necessarily treasonous to make it plain he is among those who would rather switch than fight.

It is not necessarily treasonous to contend that his country cannot win the war in Southeast Asia.

It is not treasonous to suggest that the continuation of the conflict holds within it the seeds of far greater conflict, as he suggests. This is something even a fool would know to be true. It is a part of the calculated risk America takes in honoring its word to a small ally beset from within and from without by those who would destroy its independence.

The formula for the conquest of this great republic, the one real bastion the world has known for self-government by a sovereign

Fenton, John M. *In Your Opinion: A Gallup Poll Editor Looks at Polls, Politics and the People from 1945 to 1960*. Boston, Little Brown and Co., 1960.

Gallup, George H. *The Pulse of Democracy*. New York, Simon and Schuster, 1940.

———. *A Guide to Public Opinion Polls*, Princeton University Press, 1948.

Meier, Norman C. and Saunders, Harold W. (eds). *The Polls and Public Opinion, The Iowa Conference on Attitude and Opinion Research*. New York, Henry A. Holt and Co., 1949.

Motselier, Frederic and others. *The Pre-election Polls of 1948: Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts*. New York, Social Science Research Council.

Rogers, Lindsay. *The Pollsters: Public Opinion, Politics, and Democratic Leadership*. Alfred Knopf, 1949, New York.

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

NOTE.—Gallup Poll statistics (unless source otherwise cited) were taken from *The New York Times*, (43 dates, Roosevelt period); the files at the Truman Library (Truman administration); the *Public Opinion Quarterly*, every issue 1937 to 1966 (Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations); and the *Kansas City Star* (Johnson administration).

DOCUMENTS

Letters and clippings on file at Truman Library, 1944 through 1952. *Democrat National Committee Clipping File* and *Personal Papers of Harry S. Truman* file.

MILITARY OVERSEAS MAIL

(Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, with an ever-increasing volume of mail flowing to our servicemen overseas, facilities for handling this mail are overtaxed and inadequate in many parts of the world. This is an area of vital concern to our Post Office Committee.

The military mail terminal at Frankfurt, Germany, processes airmail to every major installation in Europe. On April 6, 1967, in cooperation with the German Republic, a new $2 million facility was dedicated at Frankfurt. Described as the second largest and most modern military air mail terminal in the world, it was built by the Frankfurt Airport-Main Co., in close cooperation with U.S. Air Force personnel.

Upon my request, the chief of the USAF European postal and courier region, Col. Harold W. Brazier, furnished me with a narrative of the dedication proceedings. From all reports, it was indeed a great day for the United States and the U.S. Air Force, and also for the Flughafen director, Herr Lange.

Our worldwide, integrated Air Force postal system, known as the U.S. Air Force Postal and Courier Service, deserves a great deal of credit, and the establishment of a single integrated system on January 1 of this year was a giant step forward in achieving efficient and expeditious service to our military personnel overseas.

With permission, I include below a résumé of the dedication ceremony of the Frankfurt Aerial Mail Terminal by Col. Harold W. Brazier; an excerpt from the speech of Ministerpräsident Zinn; an article from the Frankfurter Rundschau, April 7, 1967; and an article from the Stars and Stripes, April 7, 1967:

DEDICATION CEREMONY, FRANKFURT AERIAL MAIL TERMINAL, FRANKFURT, GERMANY

A vital link was forged in the worldwide Air Force postal and courier chain with the dedication of the new Frankfurt Aerial Mail Terminal on 6 April 1967. The dedication took place at the Frankfurt Flughafen with representatives from the U.S. Consulate, the State of Hesse, and the United States Air Force in attendance. The proceeding was opened with a speech by the Flughafen Director, Herr Lange, who gave a general description of the use to which the terminal would be put. He also cited the close relationship between his employees and Air Force personnel. Director Lange then introduced Herr Dr. Georg-August Zinn, Ministerpresident of the State of Hesse, who spoke on the excellent cooperation between officers, engineers and airmen of the U.S. Air Force and the Flughafen Frankfurt/Main A.G. and of the fact that the new building will be an important improvement for the landing of military airmail at this airport as it will allow the use of mechanized equipment. Finally, Dr. Zinn introduced Lt. General Arthur C. Agan Jr., Vice Commander in Chief, USAFE, who formally accepted the new building for the United States Air Force.

Each of the speakers emphasized the importance of this terminal as a vital link in the USAF worldwide system. Further, the speakers alluded to the excellent state of cooperation which exists between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America as exemplified by the expeditious and excellent manner in which the building was planned and constructed.

General Agan pointed out in his remarks that the terminal would soon be equipped with modern, mechanized mail handling equipment. When so equipped, he stated, "this will be the most modern military mail facility in the world."

Also in attendance at the ceremony was Colonel Harold W. Brazier, Chief of the USAF European Postal and Courier Region, and Lt. Colonel Harry F. Collins, Chief of the North Germany District, who will actually operate the terminal as part of his overall function. Unable to attend was the Chief of the USAF Postal and Courier Service, Colonel Andrew DiAntonio.

The dedication was officially completed when Herr Dr. Zinn and General Agan exchanged a sack of mail symbolic of the transfer of the building from the Flughafen officials to the Air Force.

The USAFE Band under the direction of Captain Edward D'Alfonso played before and after the speeches and a luncheon banquet was served to all who attended. At the conclusion of the luncheon, the Ministerpresident and General Agan were given a tour of the building by Lt. Gene S. Bartlow, Officer-in-Charge of the terminal.

EXCERPT FROM THE SPEECH OF MINISTERPRÄSIDENT ZINN

Ministerpräsident Zinn speaks about the excellent cooperation between officers, engineers and airmen of the U.S. Air Force and the Flughafen Frankfurt/Main AG. The air postal service of the U.S. Air Force use the civilian Airlines for the transport of their airmail. The new building will be the new home of the Air Postal Group. This is the place of the collaboration between military and private organisations.

The development of the Frankfurt Airport is very closely connected with the traffic relations between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany. Today Frankfurt is a center of the north atlantic traffic. After London and Paris Frankfurt is the third busiest airport in Europe. Especially important are airfreight and airmail. Within the last five years the amount of airmail passing the airport has almost doubled. Development of military airmail on the airport was similar. It rose from 14 million pounds in 1960 to 70 million pounds in 1966.

The new building will be an important improvement for the handling of military airmail at this airport as it will allow the use of more mechanical equipment.

Ministerpräsident Zinn now speaks about the construction of the passenger terminal building, presently under construction at this airport. This building is intended to handle 12 million passengers per year. It will be capable of handling large capacity aircraft, the so called Jumbo jets (Boeing B 747) as well.

Lufthansa also ordered this type of aircraft. The home base of this aircraft will be at Frankfurt Airport. Therefore, the airport will have to expand the facilities of the Lufthansa technical base.

The airport authority also plans the construction of a third runway to be used for take-offs only. The new runway is intended to increase the capacity of the landing system and to improve the noise situation for such surrounding communities as Raunheim, Rüsselsheim, Mörfelden, Walldorf and the Landkreis Offenbach.

The airport is more and more becoming a center of economical activity. Today already 10,000 employees work with different organizations at the airport.

Finalizing his speech Ministerpräsident Zinn compares the historical German postal organization of "Thurn und Taxis" of the last century which had its head headquarters at Frankfurt with modern airmail transport by jet-aircraft.

[Article in Frankfurter Rundschau, Apr. 7, 1967]

"RHEIN-MAIN" EMPLOYS 10,000 PEOPLE—U.S. MAIL TERMINAL OPENED—MINISTERPRESIDENT ZINN DEFENDS EXPANSION OF AIRPORT

The second largest terminal of the military mail and courier service of the U.S. Air Force was opened on Thursday at the Frankfurt airport. Daily, more than 40 truckloads of mail per day will be arriving and distributed in the 1.5 million Mark building near the Lufthansa base. Ministerpresident Zinn and Lt. General Agan, the Vice Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe, gave the opening speeches. "Rhein-Main" is the terminal center for all military mail from or to American bases in areas between Finland, Scotland, the Congo, and East Pakistan.

The American facility is located in the civil area of the airport since the shipments are transported almost exclusively by regular commercial planes. Ministerpresident Zinn called the building a "place of cooperation between the military and civil organizations which has to prove itself in the daily business routines". In 1957, the military mail terminal was just a hut. In 1962, it moved into a wing of the air cargo building. After the U.S. military mail shipments increased to 35 million kilograms in 1966, it was decided to erect a new building. The first ground breaking was done on 5 May of last year.

The future expenditures of the Frankfurt airport include the construction of a third take-off runway, the extension of the two existing take-off and landing strips by approximately 900 meters, the erection of a cargo building, and the expansion of the Lufthansa base. Ministerpresident Zinn explained in his opening speech that, with these plans, they are trying to take into consideration the space requirements, the possible alteration of the water budget and the climate, and most important, the noise problem. The third take-off runway will bring substantial relief to the noise troubled villages adjacent to the airport.

Expansion has also disadvantages.

Zinn admitted that an economically concentrated area has disadvantages to the people. But he also pointed out the significance of the airport to the inhabitants. Here, approximately 10,000 people from the villages adjacent to the airport have found work. The order volume of the airport large-scale operation amounts to 100 million Marks annually in the construction area alone. For many craft and trade operations "Rhein Main" is a vital necessity.

Hesse's biggest construction site—the new Reception Building West—is already planned for the future jumbo planes for 500 passengers. As Ministerpresident Zinn explained, the planning had been made for a traffic volume of 12 million air passengers anyway.

The expansions, projected for a later date, are already included in the construction plans. The dispatch building will be substantially expanded and a special baggage system will be installed. Also, the Lufthansa base will be considerably enlarged for the maintenance of the jumbo jets. 109 million Mark are provided for the next construction stage alone.

[From the Stars and Stripes, Apr. 7, 1967]

AUTOMATED TERMINAL TO SPEED UP MAIL HANDLING

(By Jay Dorman)

FRANKFURT, April 6 (S&S).—US-AFE and German officials Thursday hailed a new $400,000 Air Force postal terminal at the International Airport here as a major step in speeding mail service for U.S. forces in Europe.

Lt. Gen. A. C. Agan Jr., USAFE vice-commander, accepted the APO building for the Air Force from airport officials and described the facilities as a vital link in the military postal system between the United States and Europe.

The APO terminal is located on the commercial side of the Rhine-Main-Frankfurt Airport complex.

Speaker at the German-American turnover ceremony was Georg August Zinn, minister-president of the State of Hesse.

Zinn told some 500 guests that the terminal as a "development of the Frankfurt Airport is very closely connected with improved traffic operations between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany."

Agan and Zinn transferred a mail bag from an Air Force mail cart to a German airport tractor-trailer to officially open the new facility.

Also attending the ceremony was Col. Harold W. Brazier, chief of the European Region USAFE Postal Courier Service.

The USAFE band, directed by Capt. Edward V. D'Alfonso, furnished music.

Elements of the USAFE Postal and Courier Region, Det 300, headed by Lt. Col. Harry F. Collins, are operating the new facility. Although the completely automated mail handling equipment isn't fully installed, the building's ideal location will facilitate handling of a rapidly growing mail volume.

"We expect to have the automated handling system operational within another year," said 1st Lt. Gene S. Bartlow, a Det 300 postal officer.

The volume of mail handled by Air Force mailmen, officials said, has jumped from 15 million pounds in 1961 to 69.5 million in 1966. It is estimated that the volume will jump to 75 or 80 million pounds in 1967.

Before moving into the new building, the Air Force mail handlers used the second floor of a commercial warehouse at the airport. There they had to move their mail bags up and down by elevator and store mail bags on open truck docks. The new building will accommodate 20 trucks at a time whereas the old building had space for eight.

The automated mail handling system to be installed in the terminal was designed by 1st Lt. Joseph Saline, a mechanical engineer. It entails a series of conveyor belts and chutes built into the ceilings of the new building that will weigh, tag and sort mail bags under the operation of one man.

At present, the Frankfurt facility is the largest military air mail terminal in Europe, and is second in size by volume of mail handled in the world only to the Saigon, Vietnam, terminal.

(Mr. DE LA GARZA (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DE LA GARZA'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. DE LA GARZA (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DE LA GARZA'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. DE LA GARZA (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DE LA GARZA'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SUCCESS OF THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

(Mr. EVERETT (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that legislation to extend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 will be considered in the House soon, I feel that it is appropriate to comment on the success of the program.

The program has been of great benefit in my congressional district and throughout Tennessee in providing food for needy, undernourished people.

I am particularly concerned with an amendment to the food stamp legislation, as reported by the House Agriculture Committee. This amendment would require 20 percent financial participation by the States and would unquestionably cause the program to be terminated in Tennessee. I say this because it is unlikely that the State of Tennessee could make available the necessary funds. At the present level of operation the amendment would cost our State $1,650,360 per year and the amount would increase as the program continues to expand.

It is apparent that I am opposed to this amendment and I hope that my colleagues will join me in removing it from the bill when it is brought up in the House.

The food stamp program is a great program and should be permitted to continue as it is now operating.

The Chattanooga, Tenn., Times said editorially when the Food Stamp Act was passed in 1964:

> The program has been made permanent because many people believe it is an effective way to help people through economic straits when a sound diet can be of great assistance.

Since then, increasing thousands of Tennessee's low-income families have echoed that belief, in the 38 counties where the food stamp program is bringing more and better food to the 78,000 needy people taking part in it. And another 13 counties are slated to inaugurate programs before the end of June.

Take Mrs. Omie E. Smith, 63, of Memphis, and her disabled husband, Artie L. Smith, 58, who live on an income of $101 a month, mostly from social security. Mrs. Smith was among the first in line when food stamps went on sale in Memphis in February 1966, to pay $28 cash for $40 worth of the food coupons. She said:

> These stamps are going to be a big help. We had to skimp and save to get up our first payment, but it's worth it.

In all, Tennessee's participating families, at the level of operation reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in February 1967, put up slightly more than $540,000 of their own money to receive over $1 million total value of coupons. The $500,000 "bonus" means more food for the families, more business for retailers, wholesalers, and farmers, and a general boost to the entire economy of the area. In fiscal year 1966, when only 18 counties in Tennessee had the program, a total of more than $4,000,000 of added food-purchasing power flowed into the State's economy in the form of Federal food stamps.

Claude Posey, a certification worker in the Scott County Welfare Department, where the program has been operating since early 1965, notes that "Some school teachers have reported that children from stamp families are more alert in class and making better grades since the program began."

Retailers in Haywood County, where the program has also been operating for a full 2 years, agree that food stamps help people through "economic straits." Food stamp use varies with the seasonal economic picture and seasonal employment rates. But the retailers are pleased that as participants get jobs and go off the rolls, they continue to patronize the stores where they had been redeeming Federal food coupons.

At present and anticipated levels of operation of the food stamp program, it is estimated by USDA that the total Federal "bonus" coupons issued to Tennessee recipients this fiscal year may reach $5.7 million in value.

The State and localities are required to finance the administrative costs of the program, including certification of eligible families and coupon issuance and accounting. Such costs typically run to about 7 percent of the value of the bonus coupons—thus, Tennessee sources will be contributing some $400,000 to the program in fiscal 1967.

A requirement for an additional 20 percent State contribution in the future

would probably mean cancellation of the program in Tennessee. The 20-percent State participation provision is contained in the legislation to extend the food stamp program, as reported by the House Agriculture Committee. This requirement should be stricken from the bill when it is considered in the House.

Tennessee counties in food stamp program—April 1967: Anderson, Bledsoe, Campbell, Cannon, Chester, Claiborne, Cocke, Dyer, Fayette, Fentress, Grundy, Hamilton, Hancock, Hardeman, Hardin, Haywood, Henry, Knox, Lake, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Macon, Marion, McNairy, Meigs, Morgan, Pickett, Rutherford, Scott, Sequatchie, Sevier, Shelby, Smith, Sumner, Tipton, Trousdale, Weakley, and Wilson.

Scheduled for program by June 30, 1967: Clay, Coffee, DeKalb, Grainger, Hickman, Jackson, Loudon, McMinn, Obion, Overton, Putnam, Van Buren, Wayne.

SELDEN INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO CURB DAIRY IMPORTS

(Mr. SELDEN (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the dairy farmers in my district and throughout our Nation are being hard hit by imports of foreign-made dairy products which are cutting into markets for their milk. As a matter of fact, the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that some 3½ billion pounds of milk equivalent will be imported this year unless some action is taken to stop the flow.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that is designed to stem the unchecked flow of dairy imports into the United States. At the same time, this legislation will require that imported dairy products meet the high sanitary standards that our domestic milk producers must follow.

This legislation will limit imports to the average butterfat and nonfat milk solids shipped into the United States during the years 1961 through 1965. Quotas will be increased, however, as our domestic consumption of milk increases. This allows importers to share in our markets, but, at the same time, gives our dairy farmers some protection for their products.

As our urban areas become larger, there is a tendency in this country to forget the outstanding job done by our Nation's farmers. One farmer can now feed 37 Americans, making most of our work force available for producing other goods and services. Actually, we pay less of our family income for food than do the people of any other country, and this is possible because our farmers are the most efficient in the world.

Farming remains a tremendous industry in my State of Alabama, as it does throughout our Nation. Dairy marketings alone amount to about $50 million a year in Alabama. Yet, in the past 15 years we have seen the number of farms selling milk in this country drop from over a million to about 500,000. Dairy farmers are leaving the farm because the pay is low, the hours are long, and the price paid for milk is subject to sudden drops.

For our dairy farmers to continue in business, they must have some assurance that foreign subsidized surpluses will not be allowed to undermine their domestic markets. The measure I have introduced is reasonable legislation that will give them that assurance. I am anxious that it be given favorable consideration by the Congress.

MEMORIAL FOR WOODROW WILSON

(Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, when historians select great American Presidents, Woodrow Wilson is always listed.

He was a brilliant, versatile and compassionate man—a lawyer, professor, university president, Governor, President of the United States, and architect of world peace.

Woodrow Wilson's strong love of justice and freedom was evinced long before he became President.

In 1903, when he was president of Princeton University, he gave a patriotic speech containing these stirring words of challenge:

> If we do not love that which is good, we cannot achieve that which is great.

Wilson was both good and great.

A deep love of righteousness formed the basic philosophy of Woodrow Wilson and had a strong influence on the innovating university president, the reform Governor, and the progressive—and great—President of the United States.

When freedom was endangered by totalitarianism in 1917, he asked for a declaration of war before a joint session of Congress—a speech that was later described by author Edward Jablonski as, "masterly, beautifully proportioned, sprinkled with memorable phrases."

This tribute to Wilson was no surprise, because he was a gifted writer. How eloquent, beautiful, and moving his speeches were. When he was a professor, his students were so moved, they would often stand and applaud him after he delivered a lecture.

After the war, he fought hard and courageously for a League of Nations and although his plan was rejected by the U.S. Senate, that dream eventually led to the United Nations—our best hope for world peace. He once said:

> I am not one of those who have the least anxiety about the triumph of the principles I have stood for. That we shall prevail is as sure as that God reigns.

Wilson's ideals still prevail and will endure, because they are right and fair.

It is disgraceful and incredible that 43 years after his death, no memorial has been erected in Washington to honor Woodrow Wilson—the man whose leadership helped save the world from disaster. A memorial should be authorized by Congress to honor him and approval should not be postponed any longer.

I am proud to join my colleagues in the House in helping to cosponsor legislation to build such a memorial. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., the distinguished U.S. Senator of New Jersey, is heading the fight in the Senate for a suitable memorial and I hope that many others will help in both the House and Senate.

Wilson's wife, quoting from Wordsworth, once called him, "A noticeable man." But he was much more than noticeable, he was great in many ways—in mind, spirit, and his incomparable sense of honor.

Woodrow Wilson gave much to America—in a sense, even his life—hoping, working, and fighting for enduring world peace.

But the Nation he led and helped save has ignored him—in its own Capital. How ironic, how cruel, how tragic this ingratitude is.

America should rectify this shame by erecting an outstanding memorial in Woodrow Wilson's honor.

DECISION OF OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY TO FUND THE SOUTHWEST ALABAMA FARMERS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION SHOULD BE APPLAUDED

(Mr. SCHEUER (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Office of Economic Opportunity to fund the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association should be applauded. This self-help economic development program is a reaffirmation of the basic mandate of Congress that programs funded by the OEO strike at the root causes of poverty. Mr. Shriver and his staff are to be congratulated on their dedication and imagination in making this grant. In doing so, they have shown that it is possible for the Federal Government to provide a real alternative to thousands of poor people in one of our Nation's most impoverished areas who otherwise would be forced to migrate to the city slums. I urge all persons who support the war on poverty to heartily support SWAFCA—for it is the kind of program we must continue to develop if we are to eliminate poverty in our Nation.

(Mr. SCHEUER (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. SCHEUER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANCE OF SST TO THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

(Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the president of the Air Transport Association, Mr. Stuart G. Tipton, made a most interesting state-

ment about the supersonic transport development program which seems particularly pertinent now that the President has requested funds to continue this program.

Speaking before a Washington aviation group, Mr. Tipton noted that the SST program was not initiated just to enhance our prestige or even to advance our technology—although I am sure he agrees with me that these are important considerations in themselves. Rather, he said, the SST program was undertaken "to achieve a very cold and very hard economic objective on behalf of the people of the United States."

Therefore, he continued:

> The judgment as to whether the project should continue has to be based upon these same cold hard realities. The question that constantly must be before us is whether this investment in the economic future of the U.S. is a good one or is not.

With your indulgence, then, I would like to take a few minutes to address myself to this question.

It is true that the SST program will require a substantial investment. Some $500 million already has been appropriated and approximately $700 million more will be required to see the program through the prototype construction and flight test phase. Moreover, it is conceivable that the Federal Government could become further obligated—at least through the extension of some form of credit assistance to the participating manufacturers.

Consequently, the Congress must ask itself whether the prospects for the program warrant such an investment. I think the answer is an unqualified yes.

The FAA estimates that at least 500 SST's will be needed by 1990 to serve the transoceanic routes alone. I might add that this estimate is based on a very conservative forecast of traffic increases—10 percent per year as compared with an annual average of 17 percent since 1946. It is very possible, then, that the market has been underestimated rather than overestimated.

But even a market of 500 SST's would seen to be sufficient justification for proceeding with the program. Under the terms of the recoupment formula negotiated with the participating manufacturers, the Government would recover all of its investment on the sale of 300 aircraft. Moreover, it would continue to collect royalties on sales above the point for a period of at least 15 years.

Of course, if it is determined after further research and testing that the SST can operate over populated land areas without creating sonic boom problems, then the market for the aircraft would more than double. As many as 1,200 SST's might be sold by 1990.

The impact of a 500 to 1,200 SST production program on the national economy would be staggering. Based on an individual selling price of $40 million per SST, the value of this production program would be $20 to $48 billion. And, contrary to popular opinion, this money will not be spent just in the Seattle and Cincinnati areas, which are the home bases for Boeing and General Electric, respectively. Approximately 65 percent of production business will be channeled out to companies all over the United States.

Moreover, a production program of this size will create many new jobs for Americans. Mr. Tipton estimates that 250,000 new long-term jobs will be created directly and indirectly by the production of the SST. The annual payroll of these quarter of a million jobs is estimated at $2½ billion.

Finally, there are the balance-of-payment considerations associated with the SST program. We expect that half of all SST sales will be to foreign-flag airlines. This will result in a gold inflow of $10 to $24 billion over a 15-year period. In addition, the availability of the SST will limit the sales of the Anglo-French Concorde to the U.S. airlines and thus prevent a gold outflow of several billion dollars.

In view of all these considerations, I think the question is not whether we can afford to build the SST but rather whether we can afford not to build it.

DEMOCRACY ON TRIAL IN GREECE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, along with many Americans I have been distressed by the military overthrow of constitutional government in Greece.

Press accounts indicate that the U.S. officials in Greece knew about and did not protest contingency plans for a military takeover if results of the upcoming elections were not favorable to Greek military leaders. If these accounts are true, I am sorely distressed by the role played by our foreign policy officials. If not true, the United States should give clear and explicit indication to the military junta now in command that we do not countenance morally, and do not intend to support or assist, a military dictatorship.

Many of my constituents have voiced their deep concern over the arrest of Greek citizens and their duly elected leaders for the crime of disagreeing with the political viewpoint of the military junta. They have strongly endorsed the plea which I and others have made that former Premier George Papandreou, his son Andreas and his family, and other political prisoners be assured safety.

People of this country have watched with growing alarm the stern measures which the new military rulers have instituted. We have been shocked and saddened to see American tanks, sent to Greece, first under the Marshall plan and later in concert with our NATO allies, to protect that country from tyranny and aggression, used to round up the country's legitimately elected officials; to witness the detaining of more than 5,000 political prisoners; to learn that newspapers are forbidden publications and that trade unions, athletic organizations, and political groups have been disbanded. On top of all of this, the elections scheduled for May 28 have been canceled.

As a representative from the Seventh California District which includes Berkeley, where Andreas Papandreou served for 5 years as chairman of the Economics Department of the University of California, I have a special and personal concern for his welfare and the safety of his wife and family. But perhaps even more, I have been concerned and dismayed that people throughout the birthplace of democracy have been denied the most fundamental of freedoms.

Our economic and military assistance to Greece over the past 20 years totals nearly $4 billion. I submit that before the United States grants any further assistance to Greece, it is important that we receive assurances on three points:

First, that constitutional government be restored, with elections held as scheduled;

Second, that prisoners whose only offense is opposition to the military clique now in command, be released and their safety assured; and,

Third, that the basic freedoms of speech, assembly, and press be restored.

I urge the President, the Secretary of State, and all American officials concerned, not to settle for less. As a Member of Congress I intend to insist on these assurances in matters of any future appropriations for Greece. I do not think we can or should be satisfied with the vague promises that constitutional amendments will be submitted to the people "at some future time" or that elections will be held "when conditions permit."

Freedom faces a great test in Greece today. As perhaps the leading advocates and practitioners of this political philosophy, I believe our commitment to its full restitution should be unwavering and without reservation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. CELLER), for Thursday, May 11, 1967, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of New York (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE), for 1 hour, today; to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE), for 15 minutes, on May 15, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. SMITH of New York), for 20 minutes, on May 15, 1967.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 16, 1967
For actions of May 15, 1967
90th-1st; No. 75

CONTENTS

Acreage allotment.....2
Appropriations.....7
Awards.....14
Budget.....36
Conservation.....12
Cooperatives.....6
Cosponsors.....24
Costs.....42
Credit.....31
Dairy imports.....3
Estimates.....36,42
Farm prices.....10
[illegible]od.....13
Food prices.....5
Food stamps.....1,28
Foreign trade.....3,33,38
Forestry.....35
Fruit.....3
Grains.....3
Grazing land.....11
Housing.....21
Job corps.....27
Labor.....32
Lands.....41
Meat imports.....38
Mid-decade census.....23
Mink.....33
Peace corps.....22
Personnel.....40
Population.....17
Poverty.....6,18,29
Public range lands.....11
Reclamation.....41
Recreation.....19,37
Reorganization.....20
Retirement.....40
Rice acreage.....26
SCS budget.....12
Social Planning.....15
Standard Reference Data...8
Tariff.....33
Taxation.....39
Tobacco.....2
Transportation.....34
Truth-in-lending.....25
TVA.....30
User charges.....9
Vegetable.....3
Water-Sewer Grants.....4
Claude Wickard.....16
Wool.....33
World Food Crisis.....13

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated food stamp bill. Several Reps. deplored increase in dairy, vegetable, and fruit imports. House passed bills to authorize transfer of tobacco allotments.

HOUSE

1. FOOD STAMPS. Began and completed general debate on H. R. 1318, to authorize appropriations for the food stamp program for years after the fiscal year 1967. pp. H5417-38

2. TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS. Passed without amendment H. R. 5702, to remove the 5-acre limitation on the amount of tobacco allotment acreage which may be leased. pp. H5410-11

Passed as reported H. R. 8265, to authorize transfers of tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas. p. H5411

3. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Monagan deplored increases in footwear imports. p. H5439
Reps. Andrews (N. Dak.), Steiger (Wis.), and Langen deplored increases in dairy imports. pp. H5469, 5479-80, 5487-91
Rep. Burke, Fla., deplored increases in vegetable-fruit imports. p. H5491
Rep. Nelson claimed U. S. negotiators have capitulated over the issue of a guaranteed percentage of the European Common Market grain trade. pp. H5493-4

4. WATER-SEWER GRANTS. Rep. Widnall said more money is needed for the water-and-sewer grant program. pp. H5485-7

5. FOOD PRICES. Rep. Nelsen inserted an article which, he said, supports his contention that "this administration has a deliberate cheap food policy." p. H5493

6. COOPERATIVES; POVERTY. Rep. Burton, Calif., expressed pleasure at the OEO gra(to the Scuthwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association. p. H5526

7. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported the independent offices appropriation bill, H. R. 9960 (H. Rept. 259) (May 12). p. H5545

8. STANDARD REFERENCE DATA. The Science and Astronautics Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6279, to provide for collection, compilation, critical evaluation, publication, and sale of standard reference data (H. Rept. 260) p. H5545

9. USER CHARGES. Received the Budget Bureau's annual report on the user charges program. p. H5545

SENATE

10. FARM PRICES. Sen. Symington discussed a letter he received from a Mo. farmer critical of current farm price levels. p. S6811

11. GRAZING LAND. Sen. Bible commended the Forest Service on the management of public range lands and inserted a speech by FS Chief Edward Cliff, "Grazing Policies on Forest Lands: A Look at the Next 20 Years." pp. S6816-8

12. CONSERVATION. Sen. Pearson discussed the SCS budget relating to the Great Plains conservation program and watershed project planning assistance and urged the Appropriations Committee to restore the cuts made in this budget and bring it up to the 1967 level. p. S6823

13. FOOD. Sen. Pearson discussed and inserted Rep. Dole's analysis of the world food crisis and the impact on the American farmer. pp. S6824-7

14. AWARDS. Sen. Ervin commended ASCS Administrator Horace Godfrey on receiving a Civil Service League award. p. S6823

(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter in this sentence referred to as the 'Secretary')";

(2) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(3) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(4) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(b) Paragraph (11) of section 5200 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 84) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator or the Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Administrator or Administration" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

SEC. 28. Any function or authority vested in or exercisable by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Chairman thereof, or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation immediately before the enactment of this Act shall not by this section or anything therein be affected or impaired, or subjected to any restriction or limitation to which it was not then subject.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 42 is to correct Federal law relating to housing and urban development to reflect the creation of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the transfer to the Secretary of the Department the functions and powers previously vested in the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent units and officials.

No new programs are created by the resolution and no programs are changed. Its provisions are in no way substantive.

The resolution merely changes the names of organizations and officials in the various statutes relating to housing and urban development so that they will conform to the names established by the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development Act established the Department of Housing and Urban Development effective November 9, 1965. Under that act, all of the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its Administrator and the other agencies and officials formerly contained in that Agency were transferred to and vested in the Secretary.

As a result of the law establishing the Department, and the laws enacted since then, the various housing and urban development laws now contain a mixture of names of officials and agencies. In some laws the terms "commissioner," "administrator," and "secretary" all appear, whereas under the Department Act the word "secretary" should be used throughout the law. The present laws are therefore inaccurate and confusing.

The resolution would correct these laws and eliminate the inaccuracies and confusion.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is completely noncontroversial. It passed the Senate unanimously and was reported from our committee unanimously. As the letter from Secretary Weaver printed on page 2 of the report states, its enactment will not cost the Government a single cent. It is obvious that sooner or later these technical changes in the law must be made, and I hope that all of my colleagues will agree to the passage of this resolution this afternoon.

(Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has correctly stated the purport of the bill. It was reported out of the committee unanimously.

It attempts to correct obsolete references made in the past in the existing housing legislation and brings up to date nomenclature with respect to laws governing housing and urban development.

I urge passage of this bill.

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 42.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 471, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 471

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1318) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendments recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to to gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 471 provides an open rule wtih 2 hours of general debate, for consideration of H.R. 1318, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. The resolution further provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee amendments now in the bill, without the intervention of any point of order. The waiver of any point of order in this case is necessary in order that the committee amendments may be considered.

The Food Stamp Act of 1964 established a national policy that, in order to promote the general welfare, the Nation's abundance of food shall be utilized cooperatively by the States, the Federal Government, and local governmental units to the maximum extent practicable to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's population and to raise levels of nutrition among economically needy households.

In those areas of the country desiring to participate in the program, public assistance and other low-income households are certified by the local counterpart offices of the State welfare agency, using criteria developed by the State. Eligible families are required to pay about what they normally spend for food for stamps and, in return, receive stamps of greater monetary value. The amount of the payment varies by the size and income of the household. The State agencies also arrange for the sale of the stamp to participants—either through local offices or through banks contracted by the State to perform this function.

Participants then use these stamps at certificated grocery stores just like cash, and may buy any food for human consumption except for identifiable imported items. The stamps may not be used to purchase tobacco or alcoholic beverages. Grocers redeem the stamps at their banks and the banks are reimbursed for the face value of the stamps through the Federal Reserve System.

H.R. 1318 extends the food-stamp program for 1 year, authorizing an appropriation of $195 million for its operation from June 30, 1967, to July 1, 1968. However, the bill, as amended by the Committee on Agriculture, provides that beginning July 1, 1969, each participating State or political subdivision thereof will pay 20 percent of the cost of bonus stamps distributed to eligible households. This would be in addition to part of their own supervisory costs of the program in which the States now share.

Personally, I am opposed to the committee amendment and hope it will be defeated, but in order that H.R. 1318

and amendments thereto may be considered by the whole House, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 471.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I concur in what has been said by my colleague from Hawaii as to the provisions of House Resolution 471.

I might disagree with the latter part of the gentleman's statement, as to his position on the amendments which apparently will be offered to the bill.

I should like to comment on those amendments of the House Committee on Agriculture. The committee labored many, many hours on this piece of legislation, which is to come before the House and made some amendments which certainly will be discussed in detail when this matter comes up for debate.

I should like to point out that one of these amendments was to make this a 1-year program rather than a permanent program as proposed by the author of the bill.

Certainly, this has been mushrooming by leaps and bounds since it was first initiated as a pilot program. H.R. 1318 calls for an expenditure of $195 million in fiscal 1968.

If the bill should be enacted into law as proposed by the author, the sky would be the limit—$195 million a year would not even start to touch the cost of this program.

Several reports have been put out as to the cost of the program, which would be astronomical if we were to remove the limitation the House Committee on Agriculture put into the bill, and were to remove any legislative ceiling on annual appropriations for its operation.

A Department of Agriculture study prepared in 1957 estimated the cost of a national food stamp program such as that proposed by the author at a minimum of $600 million, while a full-scale effort would be priced at $2.5 billion.

I wish to commend the House Committee on Agriculture for the two amendments it inserted in the bill; first, making it a 1-year rather than a permanent program, and, second, making it subject to annual appropriations through the House Appropriations Committee.

As to the question of whether the States should participate 20 percent after 1 year in the cost of this program, that is something which needs the attention of each and every State government of the 50 States. I might say that I have already heard from the State of Ohio, and the Governor of our State says that the cost would be more than the State of Ohio could bear for such a program.

I point out these things to the Members of the House, because these are three important areas which will need the attention of Members, since there is more involved here than just a continuation of the food stamp program as we have had it before us in previous years.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1318) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1318, with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is utterly unnecessary to go into a discussion of the nature of the food stamp plan. It is rather generally understood that a great many Members feel it is a highly desirable plan. I am one of those Members. I think it is a good plan and it is the best one we have yet devised for the distribution of food to the needy. I think it keeps the distribution of food in commercial channels. I think it retains the self-respect of the recipient. I think those are desirable objectives. It is an orderly and effective program. It has served very well on a rather limited scale for about 3 years. It is now before us for renewal.

There are three sharply differing viewpoints in reference to this program. There are those who believe that this program should be continued on a permanent basis without any very effective legislative limitations on its operation other than by the Committee on Appropriations. I think this view is very well expressed by the author of the original bill. The gentlewoman from Missouri's [Mrs. SULLIVAN] bill proposes substantially that approach.

In the second place, there are those who believe that we should scrap the program entirely because they feel it is too expensive, that it is inefficient, and that it does not get the results which many of us think it does. There is a substantial acceptance of this viewpoint which is shared by some members of the Committee on Agriculture.

Lastly, there is a third viewpoint which I think is pretty fairly represented by the committee amendments which will be presented to the House. That is that we should continue the program because it is in our opinion, doing a good job, but that we would be ill advised simply to turn it loose with no effective legislative limitations on the way it is to be administered and no limit as to time it is to continue without legislative review and with no effective requirement as to cooperation on the part of the States. I personally share this third view and that is the view of the overwhelming majority of the Committee on Agriculture, as expressed by our recent vote.

Therefore, we have reported this bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass with certain amendments. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] referred to those proposed amendments.

Mr. Chairman, we feel it is rather important that the States should be active participants in the support of this program—both in direct financial support and in interested consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that there is a decided difference of opinion, both in the Congress and over the country, regarding the matter of States rights.

Further, I suppose, as one of the elder Members of the House, I probably hold to the old-fashioned view that our States are indeed real governmental entities and that they should contribute substantially to the operations of Government in this country. However, I have long recognized, as I fear some people do not like to admit, that with rights always go responsibilities, obligations, and duties.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those who would suggest that the States should have the power to make all of the decisions and that the Federal Government should do no more than pay the bills. Nor, does the proposal brought to the Members of the House for their consideration by the Committee on Agriculture make or indicate any such suggestion.

The measure does suggest that the States should exercise a real and effective control over the operation of this program within the boundaries of the various States. However, it is the feeling of the Committee on Agriculture, that the States should make at least a fair—at least a token—contribution. And, Mr. Chairman, it is not much more than a token contribution. We are only asking that the States put up $1 out of every $5 involved in this program. We are not asking that the States carry half of this cost. We are not asking that the States carry two-thirds of this cost. We are not asking that the States put up all of these dollars. However, we are asking that the States put up $1 out of every $5, an amount which we feel is entirely reasonable. We feel that the various States should, at least make that much contribution. If the States are going to exercise these controls over the operations of the program, I, for one, feel that they should make a modest contribution.

Nor can I, Mr. Chairman, accept the suggestion that the States cannot make this modest contribution. Every State contributes far more to the construction of State and local highways. Every State contributes a far larger part of the cost of general welfare. Every State contributes far more to the support of schools, to which the Federal Government has recently decided to make a substantial payment.

No, Mr. Chairman, every State in this Union can contribute if it wants to do so. The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that there are those who, while professing to seek State participation in the management of this program, do not in fact welcome any participation except to the extent that it rubberstamps their views.

The further truth is, Mr. Chairman, that no State is going to be very careful about the certification of beneficiaries if additional beneficiaries can be put on the rolls with no cost to the State or local governments. The members of the Agriculture Committee feel that common business judgment requires that there be a contribution by the States if we are to avoid future scandals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, we want the States to have a real active interest and control over the operation of this program. We feel that if the States are going to have that interest and control, it is nothing but right and proper that they should contribute substantially—and this is not very substantially—it is only 20 percent of the cost of the program.

Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Agriculture did not look upon this program as something that we wanted to wreck. The House Committee on Agriculture is not a wrecking crew.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard the charge made since the Committee on Agriculture acted upon this measure, that we sought simply to scuttle this program. No such thing is intended and no such thing was considered or desired by the majority of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, had we intended to scuttle this program, had we intended to permit this contribution on the part of the States to become burdensome to carry out, we certainly would have made the State contribution effective this year. There is no reason for not making it effective this year, except that your Committee on Agriculture knew, as the Members of the House know, that most of the legislatures of this Nation have either already adjourned for this year, or will shortly adjourn. Most of them will not be in session for another 2 years.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we have taken the precaution to provide that no contribution shall be required of the States for the next 2 years. That is not because we want to give the States a free ride. It is because we recognize the impracticability of the State legislatures meeting this requirement, a requirement which was not in the original law.

Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness your committee tried to bring to the floor of the House a practicable, workable program, a program which would not impose an unfair burden upon any State—a program we felt could be passed by this House. We think we have presented such a program. We think that the original bill did not present such a program.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the issue which is now pending before us simply boils down to this: Do we believe in States rights? There are those of this body who do not. I happen to be one who does.

Mr. Chairman, do we want the States to be an active participant in this program? I want them to be a participant in the program.

Then, Mr. Chairman, the other question which naturally follows is this: Do we believe that if they are to exercise certain rights and privileges, that the States, as well as individuals, have responsibilities and obligations which go along with those rights?

Mr. Chairman, a great majority of the House Committee on Agriculture believes that the States do have these obligations and responsibilities which go along with these rights.

We believe as an individual or as a State you cannot enjoy rights without assuming responsibilities. For that reason we have asked the Federal Government to recognize the rights of States in shaping the program and administering it within the States. We have recognized along with that the right and the duty of the State to participate in this program financially. We believe that with these rights and obligations, this is a good program and should be enacted. The committee supports the food stamp program but feels it should be limited by the two committee amendments. We want a bill and we believe we can get a bill with these amendments. We believe that without such amendments it will be impossible to get a bill. Possibly the real question is whether we want to get a bill or make a record.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, enactment of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 represented a major policy change or shift with regard to Government food distribution. It was designed to supplant a system of direct distribution which was confined to surplus food.

The food stamp program was initiated as an attempt to provide low-income families with a better balanced and more nutritious diet than they could otherwise expect to enjoy.

Under this program eligible families exchanged the amount of money they would normally spend for food for an allotment of food coupons worth more. They then used the coupons as they would use cash to purchase more and better food at the local grocery stores.

The average American family today spends less than 20 percent of its income for food, but low-income families usually spend much more. Some of them spend more than half of their income just for food, and even then they often cannot afford the type of nourishing food which they need for good health.

These low-income families could use more fruits, vegetables and livestock products.

So in reality the food stamp program serves a dual purpose. It provides nourishing and healthful food for those who need it, and it helps farmers by increasing the consumption of meat, milk, eggs, fresh fruits, vegetables, and grains.

We are today debating the bill H.R. 1318, a proposal to extend the food stamp program. Mr. Chairman, I support the bill. The testimony I heard during the House Committee on Agriculture hearings has convinced me that with proper administration the food stamp program can do the job for which Congress originally created it.

I will be the first to tell you the program is by no means perfect, and many of us have had our doubts and our reservations about it. I did not support this program when it originally passed the Congress, but I believe it is a more effective program than the waste involved in the direct distribution program, and it appears that many of the problems which have confronted us in the past are now being satisfactorily worked out.

The amendments by the House Committee on Agriculture to the bill, H.R. 1318, would do these things. First the appropriation authority would be extended for 1 more year through June 30, 1968. As originally proposed, the bill would have provided appropriation authority for years beyond, in effect, permanently extending the program. We on the Committee on Agriculture feel the responsibility of Congress goes beyond the role of simply providing money for this program. We feel the objectives and the operations of the food stamp program should be thoroughly reviewed on a periodic basis. This amendment is intended to accomplish that purpose.

By the second amendment we provide a ceiling of $195 million to be placed on the amount of funds that can be appropriated for the program during the fiscal year 1968.

As originally proposed, the bill—H.R. 1318—would have removed any legislative ceiling on annual appropriations for its operation. One of my reservations about the program in the past has been in regard to its expansion.

This is why I favor our committee's action in providing that the food stamp program may expand in an orderly fashion within the limits set by the Congress.

Finally, our third amendment, beginning July 1, 1969, would provide that each participating State or political subdivision thereof would be required to pay 20 percent of the bonus value of the food stamps issued to eligible households.

The amendment providing for State participation, in my opinion, is certainly a sound one, and the formula arrived at by our committee appears to me to be both reasonable and realistic. It is designed to strengthen State and local participation and responsibility in the food stamp program.

Although it was felt that the State-sharing principle should be incorporated in the program as soon as possible, the committee recognizes that State legislatures, particularly those which meet biannually, need time to appropriate sufficient funds to keep the program in operation.

Now there are a number of valid and substantive reasons to recommend the incorporation of the State-sharing principle in the food stamp program.

Let me point out first that all Federal welfare programs now in effect require State or local sharing of some portion of the cost, and most of the programs require a far higher ratio of sharing than is

contemplated by the committee amendment to H.R. 1318.

To those of us who have become concerned in recent years over the growing trend toward the centralization of power in Washington, it seems appropriate that efforts to maintain a balance between Federal authority and local responsibility should be made wherever possible. I view the State-sharing principle recommended in the bill before us as a move in that direction.

The principal argument against the 20-percent State cost-sharing amendment has been that the financial resources of the States are so limited that they will be unable to meet the 20-percent matching requirement.

The committee has pointed out, however, that just as the States now tax their citizens to raise funds to match the Federal highway program, the aid to dependent children program, and a host of other Federal-State programs they can likewise be expected to meet a modest share of the cost of this program.

The States have at their disposal nearly every means of raising revenue that is possessed by the Federal Government. More important, the committee feels, State and local cost sharing will will bring greater local responsibility and control into the operation of this program.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to reiterate my support for the extension of the food stamp program as embodied in the bill, H.R. 1318. I support its passage wholeheartedly with the committee amendment included.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I have seen several bills introduced particularly by Members on your side of the aisle seeking shared revenue by the Federal Government, and I have been under the impression that the reason you folks sought the Federal Government to share its revenues was because of the fact that the States had inadequate sums of money with which they could get along.

I have seen bills introduced by dozens of Republicans in the House with that in mind. In view of that fact, and in view of the cry that the States do not have sufficient revenue with which to carry out their governments' purposes, do you not believe that requiring the States to contribute 20 percent to this food stamp plan, if it is enacted, would work a further hardship on the State governments insofar as their finances are concerned?

Mrs. MAY. I might say that the gentleman assumes too much, at least as far as I am concerned, as to why several Federal-State sharing bills have been introduced by my colleagues on my side of the aisle. The lack of revenue at the State level is far from the only reason. I might point to the recent education bill amendment as proposed by Congressman QUIE. Here is where we are attempting to do far more for the States than sharing revenue. We are attempting to give them some flexibility and responsibility in the administration of their programs. I think the same principle would apply to our cost-sharing principle in relation to the food stamp bill, and I think that is the important factor.

After all, under this bill we are putting up 80 percent of Federal revenues to help the States with their food stamp program.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the author of this bill, an original advocate of the food stamp program, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for his courtesy and for his assistance in getting this bill to the floor. I appreciate what he has done. I also appreciate the remarks of the gentlewoman from Washington and her support for this program, although she opposed it 3 years ago. I do not agree with her argument, however, for State sharing of the cost of the coupons.

Mr. Chairman, as the author of the bill now before the House, and as the sponsor of the 1964 act which this bill would amend, I want to begin my statement today by saying that all of the hopes and expectations which we had for the food stamp program 3 years ago, when it was so bitterly fought out here on the House floor, have been realized in the successful operation of the program.

I might add that the very same attacks which were made on the legislation 3 years ago by all of the minority members of the Committee on Agriculture are once again being made by most of the minority in virtually the identical language. This leads one to wonder whether the minority members who so strongly opposed the program in 1964, and who are so strongly opposing it this year, have taken the trouble to find out how the program operates. It was a great disappointment to me to discover that nearly half of all of the members of the Committee on Agriculture which handles this legislation do not have the food stamp program operating in their own congressional districts.

The views in the minority report, therefore, can be said to represent the feelings largely of a segment of the House of Representatives which does not have the program operating and does not want the rest of us to have it either—even though our people find it the most effective and the most dignified and the most humane and intelligent manner in which to aid low-income families in this great country to enjoy an American style of living at the dinner table.

A LAW TO OUTLAW HUNGER IN THE UNITED STATES

Thirteen years ago when I introduced my first food stamp bill, I described it as a measure to "outlaw hunger in the United States." It took 10 long years to enact the legislation under which the food stamp program is now operating in 41 States, and in the District of Columbia. It will soon be starting in Massachusetts, also. We are no longer talking theory about how a food stamp program might operate if enacted into law; it is a going program which, by the end of this fiscal year, a month and a half from now, will have about two million Americans participating, paying a substantial portion of their own limited incomes for food in order to obtain the food stamp coupons which enable them to purchase a good, well-rounded, nutritious diet.

A dozen years ago, the Secretary of Agriculture at that time, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, sent to the Congress a document which purported to be a report on the advisability of establishing a food stamp program. The Ezra Taft Benson report said that such a program would accomplish no good whatsoever; that it would cost the American taxpayers from $600 million to $2,500 million a year, and so on. It was one of the most fanciful and imaginative documents Secretary Benson ever sent to the Congress, and bore little or no relationship to the facts as they have developed under the food stamp program which we have had in effect under the act of 1964, or to the pilot programs which were initiated at my request by President Kennedy in the first months of his first year in office, in 1961.

Interestingly enough, however, the minority report on H.R. 1318 devotes many pages to paragraphs and sections lifted right out of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson's 1957 report to the Congress, including Mr. Benson's incredible figures on the probable cost of the program.

THE EZRA BENSON CASE AGAINST FOOD STAMPS

The bill before us today would continue a program which up to now has not cost as much as $125 million a year. By the end of this fiscal year next month, we will be spending at the rate of $160 million. An amendment adopted by the Committee on Agriculture to H.R. 1318 would establish an authorization ceiling for the 1968 fiscal year of $195 million. This is the amount of the President's budget recommendation for fiscal 1968. And of course, no money can be spent on this program—not a penny—until Congress actually appropriates it. So let us not be frightened by Mr. Benson's 10-year-old alarm that a food stamp program would cost the American people a minimum of $600 million a year, and a potential $2,500 million a year. I know exactly how Mr. Benson arrived at his fantastic figures 10 years ago, and his method was about as scientific as many of his other recommendations on agriculture.

I do not want to devote my limited time this afternoon to a debate in absentia with the former Secretary of Agriculture who was never noted, while in that office, for his concern over low-income Americans. Under his regime we sent many billions of dollars worth of food overseas—and the Congress supported that—but very little was done in helping our own needy here in the United States to eat properly. Mr. Benson is no longer Secretary of Agriculture, and his policies have long since been repudiated, even by his own party. Thus it is a source of unhappiness to me that the minority members on the Committee on Agriculture are still quoting him, although without identification, as their expert on this program which he so bitterly opposed.

THREE CHOICES BEFORE CONGRESS

In the consideration of this measure, Mr. Chairman, the House will have three choices:

First, to continue the program without interruption and permit it to expand so that the nine States not now in the program, and many additional counties, can enter it. This would be accomplished by the passage of H.R. 1318 as introduced—defeating the committee amendments.

Second, to kill the program outright, as proposed by the majority of the minority on the Committee on Agriculture, who, after voting to add the amendments that would cripple the program, then voted against the bill as amended. They recommend that the people who need additional food in order to obtain a minimum adequate diet should get in line once a month at a municipal warehouse and be handed some cornmeal and flour and lard and powdered milk and a few other such "goodies."

Third, to continue the program, but under such legislative and budgetary handicaps that my State, I am sure, and the States of most of the other Members of the House who have food stamp projects in their districts would not or could not participate if the committee amendment on cost sharing is enacted.

Those are the three choices.

I sincerely hope that the House will help me to make this program more effective in meeting the nutritional needs of our low-income families eligible to participate, not cripple it or kill it as the committee amendments would do.

Just remember, Mr. Chairman, that the people who participate in the food stamp program are not receiving free handouts of anything. They must spend their own money—at least as much as, and often more than, they would normally spend out of their total income for food—in order to purchase the food stamps. They are checked at least every 3 months to make sure the family income or family size has not changed, which would entail adjustments in monthly food stamp purchase requirements.

PRIMARILY A FOOD UTILIZATION PROGRAM

They must participate in the program regularly; they cannot drop out one month and come in the next, unless it is because of changes in income or eligibility. In other words, they can't use their food money for food one month and for other things the next. Their food money each month must all be spent for the food stamps. This is a real sacrifice for many low-income families. If this program did not have so many other attractive features to compensate, most of them, I am sure, would reduce their food purchases when they wanted to buy something else. In this program, they do not have that choice.

That is what makes it primarily a food utilization program rather than a welfare program. This whole idea grew out of the existence of tremendous agricultural abundance—huge surpluses. We do not have such surpluses now, but we still have many people who cannot afford to eat properly, and we also have the capacity to produce far more than all the food all Americans could eat.

This program thus makes possible the intelligent utilization by Americans of some of our food abundance.

It substantially increases the total volume of food sold in this country by at least the amount of the Federal contribution to the program, and also by the additional amounts the participants spend of their own money in order to buy food stamps.

No grocery store products other than food can be purchased with the stamps. All of the increased purchasing power made possible through food stamps goes directly to the removal from the market of things American farmers produce. The only exceptions are tea, coffee, and bananas—and since two-thirds of the value of the food coupons represent the participants' own money, they should certainly be permitted to buy these particular items. But any foods identified on the label as being imported cannot be purchased with food stamps.

STATES ALREADY HAVE SUBSTANTIAL COSTS UNDER PROGRAM

The Committee on Agriculture adopted two amendments to H.R. 1318. One amendment would limit the authorization for appropriations to the 1968 fiscal year only. If that amendment is approved by Congress, it will mean that next year we will have to pass an authorization bill once again before the appropriation can be included in the Agriculture Department budget. I am not against annual review by the Committee on Agriculture of any program it authorizes; I do feel, however, that the committee has all of the authority it needs to engage in such oversight activities without making such a review mandatory as the price of continuing the food stamp program. So I shall oppose that amendment.

The other amendment is much more serious. It would require the States beginning 2 years from now to pay 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons issued to participants. We do not know what the size of the program will be in 2 years, but at the level of operations proposed for next year, the cost to the States of this 20 percent sharing requirement would be about $40 million. Two years from now it would probably be more, as more States and many more counties come into the program. The States, in most cases, cannot fund such additional costs for this program, since they already carry a substantial share of the administrative costs of the food stamp program, including the certification of eligibles by their welfare personnel, the sale and handling of the stamps—which are exactly the same as money—and similar costs.

From the information we have received from States participating in the program, we know that many, if not most, of them would have to go back to the direct surplus distribution program and give up the food stamp program if this amendment passes. Three years ago, the Committee on Agriculture called for 50-percent sharing by the States. We defeated that on the floor, just as we must defeat this year's 20-percent sharing amendment which, I am afraid, is based more on a desire to kill the program than to improve it. This is indicated by the fact that most of the members of the Committee on Agriculture who voted in favor of the 20-percent sharing amendment then voted against the bill, even after this amendment was adopted.

MANY FAMILIES EATING WELL FOR FIRST TIME

Who are the people who participate, and who benefit from this program? They are not all on welfare, by any means. Many are older couples on social security; others are the so-called working poor—large families where, no matter how hard the father might work, it is impossible for him to afford a good diet for all of the kids, with all of the other expenses a very large family might have.

I am placing in the RECORD at this point the maximum income levels in the various States for participation in the food stamp program, based on family size. There is some variation between the States. One column of this table lists the maximum liquid assets which a family may have and still participate in the program. This does not include equity in a home but does include cash, bank deposits, savings and loan shares, stocks, and so forth.

The table referred to is as follows:

Food stamp program—Eligibility standards for nonassistance households

[Standards in State plans approved under the Food Stamp Act of 1964] [1]

State	Monthly allowable income by household size										Additional for each person	Resources—Allowable liquid assets [2]
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Alaska [3]	$125	$185	$250	$315	$370	$430	$475	$520	$565	$610	$45	Same as for public assistance.
Alabama [4]	100	120	145	175	205	235	265	295	325	350	$30	4 times monthly scale.
Arkansas [4]	85	170	180	190	200	210	220	235	250	265	$15 to maximum of $325	1—$200; 2 or more—$400. [2]
California [4]	160	190	225	283	335	393	438	483	521	565	$40	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Colorado [4]	100	150	185	220	255	290	325	360	395	420	None	1, 2, 3—$1,000; add $250 each to maximum of $2,000. [3]
Connecticut [5]	140	185	235	280	335	365	395	420	445	470	$25	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
District of Columbia [4]	107	153	198	226	254	283	311	339	367	396	$25	Do.
Georgia [4]	80	130	175	195	225	245	260	275	290	300	$30 to maximum of $330	1—$800; 2 or more—$1,600.
Hawaii [4]	120	180	210	250	285	325	370	415	455	495	11—$535; 12—$575; 13—$615; 14—$655; 15—$695. (Each additional, plus $40.)	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.

Footnotes at end of table.

Food stamp program—Eligibility standards for nonassistance households—Continued

[Standards in State plans approved under the Food Stamp Act of 1964] [1]

State	Monthly allowable income by household size										Additional for each person	Resources—Allowable liquid assets [2]
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Illinois	$139	$182	$212	$259	$299	$437	$375	$414	$451	$490	$25	1—$400; 2 or more—$600.
Indiana	125	160	190	220	250	280	310	340	370	400	$25	3 times monthly scale.
Iowa	130	200	250	295	330	370	405	455	490	540	$35	1—$750; 2—$900; 3—$1,000; 4—$1,100; 5—$1,200; 6—$1,300; 7—$1,400; 8—$1,500; 9, 10, and over—$1,550.
Kansas	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)		1—$750; 2 or more—$1,250.[3]
Kentucky [4]	90	125	145	165	190	210	220	230	240	250	$10	4 times monthly scale.
Louisiana [4]	90	105	125	150	175	190	210	230	250	275	$20	1—$500; 2 or more—$1,000.[3]
Maine	130	161	191	217	239	260	282	304	316	321	11—$325; $5	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,200.
Maryland	90	125	150	175	210	230	250	270	290	310	$20	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Michigan	125	185	225	265	295	330	365	400	435	470	$35	1—$750; 2 to 5—$1,000; 6 and over—add $100 each.
Minnesota	135	205	250	290	335	370	390	425	460	495	$30	1—$750; 2 or more—$1,000.
Mississippi [5]	90	130	155	180	210	230	250	270	290	310	$15	1—$500; 2 or more—$800.
Missouri [4]	140	190	230	270	310	350	390	430	470	510	$40	1—$750; 2—$1,000; 3—$1,250; 4 or more—$1,500.
Montana [4]	125	183	212	253	290	318	353	388	413	438	$25	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Nebraska	120	180	230	270	305	335	360	385	410	435	$25	1—$750; 2 or more—$1,500.
New Jersey	150	200	250	290	330	360	390	430	460	500	$40	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
New Mexico [4]	110	150	170	190	210	230	250	270	290	310	$20	Cash: 1—$100; 2 or more—$150.[3]
New York	150	210	290	325	365	405	445	485	525	565	$40	3 times maximum allowable income.[3]
North Carolina [4]	85	110	125	140	155	170	185	195	205	215	$5 to maximum of $240	1—$500; 2—$700; add $50 each to maximum of $800.
North Dakota	140	185	260	295	330	365	385	415	440	460	$25	$1,000 per household.
Ohio	110	180	220	260	290	320	355	385	415	445	$30	$500 per household.
Oregon	128	193	221	258	288	328	357	386	411	426	$25	1 adult—$500; 2 or more—$1,000.
Pennsylvania	110	170	205	245	280	315	350	390	425	460	$30	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Rhode Island	110	150	180	215	255	290	320	345	370	395	$25	Do.
South Carolina [4]	70	90	105	115	125	135	145	155	165	175	$5 to maximum of $185	4 times monthly scale.
Tennessee	95	130	165	200	240	275	315	350	385	420	None	1—$500; 2 or more—$1,000.
Texas	100	150	170	190	210	230	250	270	290	310	$15	1—$300; 2—$450; add $50 per person to maximum of $600.[3]
Utah	104	154	184	205	235	255	284	298	316	329	11—$343; 12—$357; 13—$370; 14—$384 plus $13.	1—$4 00; 2 or more—$800.[3]
Vermont	122	180	209	238	275	309	345	374	407	439	$30	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Virginia	90	115	135	150	165	180	195	210	225	240	$5	1—$500; 2—$600; 3 or more—add $50 each to maximum of $1,000.[3]
Washington	136	172	212	242	271	297	329	360	390	420	$30	1—$336; 2—$572; 3—$612; 4—$462; 5—$671 6—$697; 7—$729; 8—$760; over 8—add $30 each.
West Virginia	80	115	135	155	170	185	200	200	200	200	None	1—$1,000; 2 or more—$1,500.
Wisconsin	115	170	205	240	270	320	350	380	410	440	$30	1—$500; 2—$750; add $100 each additional.
Wyoming	130	180	225	280	310	340	370	415	460	500	None	$1,000 per household.[3]

[1] This table lists standards in State plans approved as of July 15, 1966. As additional plans are approved, supplements will be issued.
[2] The States indicated also have limitations on other resources such as real estate, automobiles, etc.
[3] Rent up to maximum of $75 is also allowed.
[4] For households containing both public assistance recipients and nonrecipients, eligibility is based on the income and resources of the nonassistance members only. Other States base eligibility on the total income and resources of all members.
[5] Applied to both public assistance and nonpublic assistance households.
[6] Household eligible if a budget deficit exists.

These are people who are now eating well—properly—many for the first time in their lives. Letters to me from people in my district who participate are inspiring to read. They are grateful for the help, and they are, moreover, understanding of the costs of the program and willing to pay their own share, as they have been doing. They make me very proud of my association with this program.

Mr. Chairman, when we vote on this legislation later this week, I hope the Members will carefully balance the old Benson program for food handouts with the Freeman program for food stamps—weigh them critically and objectively. In many counties the Benson handout program still operates; in nearly 1,000 areas of the country, the food stamp program is now or soon will be operating. Those Members who have had both programs operating in their district can attest to the fact that the one is loosely administered and often full of cheating and the other is strictly administered and enforced, with few, if any, violations.

The two programs cost essentially about the same to the Federal Government. The counties have a choice between the two. More and more counties have requested the food stamp program, for the reasons I have cited. Let us not push them back into the kind of handout program they found so inadequate and ineffective in combating undernourishment among their poor.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS WHICH NOW HAVE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for the Members to know which of the counties in their congressional districts are participating in the food stamp program and what it means to the people in those counties in terms of additional food. On March 14, at pages A1279 through A1285, I included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a listing by congressional districts, showing the counties which are now in the program, or which are scheduled to enter it before July 1 of this year, and also those which have requested the program and which will be included in the next fiscal year if sufficient funds are appropriated and if there are no crippling amendments adopted by the Congress.

In the printed hearings of the Committee on Agriculture on H.R. 1318, there is another list, beginning on page 14, the participation in each of the counties now in the program—this one showing the number of people receiving stamps in each county, and the value of the coupons, for the month of January 1967. I urge the Members to study that tabulation.

HOW MUCH THE STAMPS COST THE INDIVIDUAL FAMILY

The hearings do not show in any quickly understandable form how much the individual family pays for its food stamps each month and what it receives in return. I think it is very important that the Members have an understanding of the requirements. It depends on the family size and the family income, but here are some typical figures for a group of families of different sizes in St. Louis. First, a four-person household:

Missouri food stamp program—Net income basis of coupon issuance

4-PERSON HOUSEHOLD

Monthly net income	Monthly			Semimonthly			Monthly net income	Monthly			Semimonthly		
	Purchase	Bonus	Total	Purchase	Bonus	Total		Purchase	Bonus	Total	Purchase	Bonus	Total
0 to $19.99	$8	$44	$52	$4	$22	$26	$100 to $109.99	$44	$34	$78	$22	$17	$39
$20 to $29.99	10	42	52	5	21	26	$110 to $119.99	48	34	82	24	17	41
$30 to $39.99	14	42	56	7	21	28	$120 to $139.99	52	32	84	26	16	42
$40 to $49.99	20	40	60	10	20	30	$140 to $159.99	56	30	86	28	15	43
$50 to $59.99	24	40	64	12	20	32	$160 to $179.99	60	28	88	30	14	44
$60 to $69.99	28	38	66	14	19	33	$180 to $199.99	64	26	90	32	13	45
$70 to $79.99	32	38	70	16	19	35	$200 to $219.99	68	24	92	34	12	46
$80 to $89.99	36	36	72	18	18	36	$220 to $239.99	72	24	96	36	12	48
$90 to $99.99	40	36	76	20	18	38	$240 to $269.99	76	24	100	38	12	50

For a single individual, or a two-person household the purchase requirements are as listed in the following table:

Missouri food stamp program—Net income basis of coupon issuance

1-PERSON HOUSEHOLD

Monthly net income	Monthly			Semimonthly			Monthly net income	Monthly			Semimonthly		
	Purchase	Bonus	Total	Purchase	Bonus	Total		Purchase	Bonus	Total	Purchase	Bonus	Total
0 to $19.99	$4	$10	$14	$2	$5	$7	$50 to $59.99	$14	$8	$22	$7	$4	$11
$20 to $29.99	8	8	16	4	4	8	$60 to $79.99	16	6	22	8	3	11
$30 to $39.99	10	8	18	5	4	9	$80 to $99.99	18	6	24	9	3	12
$40 to $49.99	12	8	20	6	4	10	$100 and over	20	6	26	10	3	13

2-PERSON HOUSEHOLD

0 to $19.99	$4	$20	$24	$2	$10	$12	$70 to $79.99	$24	$16	$40	$12	$8	$20
$20 to $29.99	8	20	28	4	10	14	$80 to $99.99	28	16	44	14	8	22
$30 to $39.99	12	18	30	6	9	15	$100 to $119.99	32	16	48	16	8	24
$40 to $49.99	16	18	34	8	9	17	$120 to $139.99	36	14	50	18	7	25
$50 to $59.99	18	18	36	9	9	18	$140 and over	40	12	52	20	6	26
$60 to $69.99	20	18	38	10	9	10							

And for a family of seven, this is the table which is used:

Missouri food stamp program—Net income basis of coupon issuance

7-PERSON HOUSEHOLD

Monthly net income	Monthly			Semimonthly			Monthly net income	Monthly			Semimonthly		
	Purchase	Bonus	Total	Purchase	Bonus	Total		Purchase	Bonus	Total	Purchase	Bonus	Total
0 to $39.99	$14	$64	$78	$7	$32	$39	$150 to $159.99	$68	$46	$114	$34	$23	$57
$40 to $49.99	20	62	82	10	31	41	$160 to $179.99	72	46	118	36	23	59
$50 to $59.99	24	62	86	12	31	43	$180 to $199.99	76	44	120	38	22	60
$60 to $69.99	30	60	90	15	30	45	$200 to $219.99	80	42	122	40	21	61
$70 to $79.99	34	60	94	17	30	47	$220 to $239.99	84	40	124	42	20	62
$80 to $89.99	40	58	98	20	29	49	$240 to $259.99	88	38	126	44	19	63
$90 to $99.99	44	58	102	22	29	51	$260 to $279.99	92	36	128	46	18	64
$100 to $109.99	50	56	106	25	28	53	$280 to $299.99	96	36	132	48	18	66
$110 to $119.99	54	54	108	27	27	54	$300 to $319.99	100	36	136	50	18	68
$120 to $129.99	58	52	110	29	26	55	$320 to $339.99	104	36	140	52	18	70
$130 to $139.99	62	50	112	31	25	56	$340 to $359.99	108	36	144	54	18	72
$140 to $149.99	66	48	114	33	24	57	$360 to $389.99	112	36	148	56	18	74

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend and congratulate the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] for her dedication to this program, which undoubtedly is one of the best operated Federal programs of all programs. In the past 3 years in its operation in 41 States, including my home State of Hawaii, it has been one of the best programs ever instituted for the needy. I wish to associate myself with the gentlewoman in the excellent statement she has made. I will join her in an effort to defeat the committee amendment calling for State contribution of 20 percent of the cost of bonus stamps.

May I ask the gentlewoman this question: Is it not true that it is not altogether true that the States are not now contributing to the cost of this excellent program because many of the participants in this program are receiving welfare money which comes from the State?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is correct.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. So that the claim that the committee amendment intends to bring in the States as cost-sharing participants in the program is not altogether a valid one, in that the States, specially in the case of States like Hawaii where so much of the money is now being contributed to welfare participants by the State, are already actually sharing in the cost. To require the States to pay an additional $40 million annually would surely kill this program in States that may not be able provide the matching funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman from Hawaii. As I said before, the States and the counties which are participating have substantial costs already under this program. They are responsible for the recertification of recipients every 3 months through their welfare caseworkers; they are responsible for the costs of distributing the food coupons, which are the same as money, and safeguarding their storage. All of these costs come to about 7 percent of the total expenditures for the program.

PROJECTED 1970 COSTS TO STATES AND LOCALITIES

Mr. Chairman, I have indicated to those Members of the House who have the food stamp program operating in their congressional districts what I believe the committee amendment, requiring 20 percent sharing by the States of the value of the bonus coupons, would mean to their States and counties at the estimated level of participation for the 1968 fiscal year. However, since this committee amendment would not become effective until July 1, 1969, I have had a projection made for me by the Department of Agriculture on the estimated participation in that fiscal year and the 20-percent cost to the States and localities under the committee amendment.

It should be kept in mind that this would be for a program susbtantially larger than the one in operation right now, covering an estimated 4,700,000 needy persons in 1,800 counties compared to the 2,000,000 persons in 875 counties in the program, or scheduled to be in the program, by the end of this fiscal year next month.

The table I am submitting lists the program in operation only in the States which have requested it and only in the areas where there has been interest expressed in having it operate. The first column of figures lists the probable total value of the bonus coupons to be issued under the program if it is permitted to expand as contemplated; the remaining three columns show the States' costs under the matching formula called for in the committee amendment. The table is as follows:

States	Projections for fiscal year 1970			
	Total value of bonus coupons [1]	Cost to States (or localities)		
		20 percent matching of cost of bonus coupons [1]	Administrative costs [2]	Total
Alabama	$7,000,000	$1,400,000	$490,000	$1,890,000
Alaska	400,000	80,000	28,000	108,000
Arizona				
Arkansas	14,000,000	2,800,000	980,000	3,780,000
California	16,000,000	3,200,000	1,120,000	4,320,000
Colorado	4,000,000	800,000	280,000	1,080,000
Connecticut	1,500,000	300,000	105,000	405,000
Delaware				
District of Columbia	3,100,000	620,000	217,000	837,000
Florida				
Georgia	10,500,000	2,100,000	735,000	2,835,000
Hawaii	500,000	100,000	35,000	135,000
Idaho				
Illinois	16,000,000	3,200,000	1,120,000	4,320,000
Indiana	5,500,000	1,100,000	385,000	1,485,000
Iowa	3,000,000	600,000	210,000	810,000
Kansas	1,000,000	200,000	70,000	270,000
Kentucky	19,000,000	3,800,000	1,330,000	5,130,000
Louisiana	17,000,000	3,400,000	1,190,000	4,590,000
Maine	750,000	150,000	52,500	202,500
Maryland	3,000,000	600,000	210,000	810,000
Massachusetts	3,000,000	600,000	210,000	810,000
Michigan	11,000,000	2,200,000	770,000	2,970,000
Minnesota	6,000,000	1,200,000	420,000	1,620,000
Mississippi	23,000,000	4,600,000	1,610,000	6,210,000
Missouri	4,500,000	900,000	315,000	1,215,000
Montana	750,000	150,000	52,500	202,500
Nebraska	$3,000,000	$600,000	$210,000	$810,000
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey	6,000,000	1,200,000	420,000	1,620,000
New Mexico	4,000,000	800,000	280,000	1,080,000
New York	22,000,000	4,400,000	1,540,000	5,940,000
North Carolina	9,500,000	1,900,000	665,000	2,565,000
North Dakota	500,000	100,000	35,000	135,000
Ohio	25,000,000	5,000,000	1,750,000	6,750,000
Oklahoma				
Oregon	1,000,000	200,000	70,000	270,000
Pennsylvania	21,000,000	4,200,000	1,470,000	5,670,000
Rhode Island	2,500,000	500,000	175,000	675,000
South Carolina	6,500,000	1,300,000	455,000	1,755,000
South Dakota	500,000	100,000	35,000	135,000
Tennessee	15,000,000	3,100,000	1,085,000	4,185,000
Texas	3,500,000	700,000	245,000	945,000
Utah	1,000,000	200,000	70,000	270,000
Vermont	750,000	150,000	52,500	202,500
Virginia	4,500,000	900,000	315,000	1,215,000
Washington	4,000,000	800,000	280,000	1,080,000
West Virginia	12,000,000	2,400,000	840,000	3,240,000
Wisconsin	6,000,000	1,200,000	420,000	1,620,000
Wyoming	750,000	150,000	52,500	202,500
Total	320,000,000	64,000,000	22,400,000	86,400,000

[1] This estimate is based upon the anticipated annual rate of bonus coupons expenditures by States at the end of the 1967 fiscal year, together with possible further program expansion in the various States for periods beyond the fiscal year 1967, based upon present information as to the general intentions of various States in requesting further program expansion in 1968 and later years.

[2] Only limited data are available on the State and local cost of intrastate program administration. These data indicate that in a typical county such costs approximate 7 percent of the value of bonus coupons; thus, State and local administrative costs have been estimated at 7 percent of the total value of the bonus coupons.

WOULD THE STATES PAY THE INCREASED COSTS OR PASS THEM ALONG TO THE COUNTIES?

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion in the House today about the ability of the States to pay millions of dollars for the food stamp program if the committee amendment on cost sharing is enacted into law. According to the information I have obtained, only 13 States of the 41 States now participating in the program finance the administratives costs of the food stamp program; most of the States pass along to the counties part or all of the administrative costs of the food stamp program.

In 13 States, the local governmental unit has to finance every single aspect of the cost of participation in the food stamp program, so an amendment requiring 20-percent sharing by the States of the value of the bonus coupons would mean millions of dollars in additional costs to the taxpayers of those counties which have the food stamp program in States like Alabama, Mississippi, California, Minnesota, and so forth. I am submitting herewith a list of the participating States divided according to the manner in which they now finance the State-local share of the administrative costs of food stamp participation:

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM—SOURCES USED IN STATES TO FINANCE COSTS OF INTRASTATE ADMINISTRATION

I. *In the following 13 States, State funds finance certification and coupon issuance costs:*

Alaska	Michigan [2]
Arkansas	New Mexico
Connecticut	Utah
District of Columbia	Vermont
Hawaii	Washington
Kentucky [1]	West Virginia
Illinois	

II. *In the following 16 States, certification and coupon issuance costs are shared by State and local governmental units:*

Georgia	Ohio
Indiana	Oregon
Louisiana	Pennsylvania
Maine	Rhode Island
Missouri	Tennessee
New York	Texas
North Carolina	Virginia
North Dakota	Wisconsin

A wide variety of cost-sharing arrangements are in effect. In some instances, State and local governmental units finance a set percentage of both certification and issuance costs. Under this type of cost sharing, the most typical share paid by the county or other local governmental unit is 50 percent. In other cases, State funds finance certification costs and the county or other local governmental unit finances the cost of issuing the coupons. In still other cases, the share to be paid by the county or local governmental units varies in accordance with a State-established criterion of financial ability.

III. *In the following 13 States, the county (or other local governmental unit) finances all certification and issuance costs:*

Alabama	Mississippi
California	Montana [3]
Colorado	Nebraska
Iowa	New Jersey
Kansas	South Carolina
Maryland	Wyoming [3]
Minnesota	

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

[1] In some counties, there is a one-time payment made by the counties at the time the program is inaugurated.

[2] If counties elect to contract with banks to issue coupons, the county must bear 60 percent of such contract costs.

[3] Under certain limited conditions, some State funds may be made available.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be happy to yield.

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to compliment the gentlewoman from Missouri for the gallant and very excellent fight she has made for this worthy cause and to associate myself in any way I can with her efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the Food Stamp Act of 1964 and I rise to its support today.

I opposed in 1964 the provision requiring the States to contribute 50 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons and I oppose the 20-percent participation feature today.

I oppose it because it would make the cost of this program prohibitive to localities. As presently operating, the food stamp plan is no handout from Washington. States and localities must spend their own tax revenues to cooperate in this program. They must maintain a staff to certify applicant households. They must maintain offices at which coupon sales are made. They must finance the handling, storing, and accounting for food coupons. These costs mount up—and with the present demand on local revenues—no locality is going to enter this program if the cost-sharing provision prevails.

Far too often, the need is the greatest in those areas which can least afford it even at present costs to the localities.

The food stamp program is no longer an experiment. It is a proven, tested, and accepted method of translating our highly developed agricultural skills into

higher nutritional levels for this Nation's less fortunate.

Perhaps the very success of this program has worked adversely to its interest here in the Congress. I dare say that no new program since 1960 has produced less critical congressional mail in proportion to its size than has the food stamp program. It has been a model of administrative simplicity. I have heard no new criticism of this program since its inception.

The program is working and working well. Let us not kill it because of its success.

Food stamp program—A projection of the value of bonus coupons that could be issued in the various States in the fiscal year 1970 and the costs to the various States

States	Projections for fiscal year 1970			
	Total value of bonus coupons [1]	Cost to States (or localities)		
		20 percent matching of bonus coupons [1]	Administrative costs [2]	Total
Alabama	$7,000,000	$1,400,000	$490,000	$1,890,000
Alaska	400,000	80,000	28,000	108,000
Arizona				
Arkansas	14,000,000	2,800,000	980,000	3,780,000
California	16,000,000	3,200,000	1,120,000	4,320,000
Colorado	4,000,000	800,000	280,000	1,080,000
Connecticut	1,500,000	300,000	105,000	405,000
Delaware				
District of Columbia	3,100,000	620,000	217,000	837,000
Florida				
Georgia	10,500,000	2,100,000	735,000	2,835,000
Hawaii	500,000	100,000	35,000	135,000
Idaho				
Illinois	16,000,000	3,200,000	1,120,000	4,320,000
Indiana	5,500,000	1,100,000	385,000	1,485,000
Iowa	3,000,000	600,000	210,000	810,000
Kansas	1,000,000	200,000	70,000	270,000
Kentucky	19,000,000	3,800,000	1,330,000	5,130,000
Louisiana	17,000,000	3,400,000	1,190,000	4,590,000
Maine	750,000	150,000	52,500	202,500
Maryland	3,000,000	600,000	210,000	810,000
Massachusetts	3,000,000	600,000	210,000	810,000
Michigan	11,000,000	2,200,000	770,000	2,970,000
Minnesota	6,000,000	1,200,000	420,000	1,620,000
Mississippi	23,000,000	4,600,000	1,610,000	6,210,000
Missouri	4,500,000	900,000	315,000	1,215,000
Montana	750,000	150,000	52,500	202,500
Nebraska	$3,000,000	$600,000	$210,000	$810,000
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey	6,000,000	1,200,000	420,000	1,620,000
New Mexico	4,000,000	800,000	280,000	1,080,000
New York	22,000,000	4,400,000	1,540,000	5,940,000
North Carolina	9,500,000	1,900,000	665,000	2,565,000
North Dakota	500,000	100,000	35,000	135,000
Ohio	25,000,000	5,000,000	1,750,000	6,750,000
Oklahoma				
Oregon	1,000,000	200,000	70,000	270,000
Pennsylvania	21,000,000	4,200,000	1,470,000	5,670,000
Rhode Island	2,500,000	500,000	175,000	675,000
South Carolina	6,500,000	1,300,000	455,000	1,755,000
South Dakota	500,000	100,000	35,000	135,000
Tennessee	15,000,000	3,100,000	1,085,000	4,185,000
Texas	3,500,000	700,000	245,000	945,000
Utah	1,000,000	200,000	70,000	270,000
Vermont	750,000	150,000	52,500	202,500
Virginia	4,500,000	900,000	315,000	1,215,000
Washington	4,000,000	800,000	280,000	1,080,000
West Virginia	12,000,000	2,400,000	840,000	3,240,000
Wisconsin	6,000,000	1,200,000	420,000	1,620,000
Wyoming	750,000	150,000	52,500	202,500
Total	320,000,000	64,000,000	22,400,000	86,400,000

[1] This estimate is based upon the anticipated annual rate of bonus coupons expenditures by States at the end of the 1967 fiscal year, together with possible further program expansion in the various States for periods beyond the fiscal year 1967, based upon present information as to the general intentions of various States in requesting further program expansion in 1968 and later years.

[2] Only limited data are available on the State and local cost of intrastate program administration. These data indicate that in a typical county such costs approximate 7 percent of the value of bonus coupons; thus, State and local administrative costs have been estimated at 7 percent of the total value of the bonus coupons.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF THOMAS S. FOLEY

I concur with the majority report that the Food Stamp Program should be continued and further expanded.

I am opposed to the committee amendment that would require, beginning July 1, 1969, that States or localities match 20 percent of the bonus cost of the coupons, in addition to the cost of intrastate program administration. That provision would make the program largely inoperative.

1. States are now sorely pressed to find the revenues to support their basic public assistance and general relief programs. In fact, the principal need for a Federal food assistance program stems from the fact that States and localities have been unable to finance a public assistance program that would provide a minimum level of food consumption for low-income families.

2. The States that now are most in need of the Food Stamp Program are the States that are now not taking full advantage of the available Federal moneys for public assistance because they have been unable to raise the required State or local tax funds. Therefore, the committee amendment will work to foreclose such States from taking advantage of the Food Stamp Program.

3. The States would have the alternative of passing on such costs to local political subdivisions. But, again, this would mean that the communities most in need of the Food Stamp Program would be the ones that would be least able to raise the required funds.

4. The States and/or localities *now* are required to finance the costs of program administration. The Department of Agriculture estimates that such costs typically run to about 7 percent of the value of the bonus coupons. In fact, during the committee hearings, it was reported that some of the localities which need the program have found it difficult to raise the funds that are required to cover these costs. To believe, therefore, that they could absorb 20 percent of the subsidy cost itself is unrealistic.

5. About 60 percent of the people now participating in the Food Stamp Program are receiving welfare grants under State or local relief funds. It is out of these grants that the families are purchasing their food coupons. So States and localities are also indirectly contributing significant sums to the program—in the form of the moneys used by welfare people to make regular coupon purchases.

6. It will be necessary for such States to contribute to the cost of the bonus coupons for both families receiving public assistance and to those families not receiving public assistance. Many of these latter families are not on public assistance because the State has been unable to finance a welfare program that was broad enough to meet their needs. For example, less than half the States have been able to take advantage of the expanded aid to dependent children with unemployed parents (ADC–UP) even though that broader program has been authorized since 1961. Therefore, it is unrealistic to believe those States would find it possible to meet the food stamp matching requirements proposed by the committee.

7. The adverse impact of this committee amendment is *immediate*—not something that will be faced 2 years from now. States will not continue to expand a program that they know they will have to abandon by 1969.

8. The Food Stamp Program has been a highly popular, effectively operated program. Its purpose has been well defined and it has been operated in a manner that preserves its food objectives. Contrary to the views of some, it does not lessen the State's responsibility for its basic welfare and relief programs. Rather it builds upon those efforts—increasing the food and nutrition of low-income families and is closely connected with the objectives of related State programs.

In summary a requirement that States contribute 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons—no matter how logical from the standpoint of Federal-State cooperation—is a requirement that many States will be unable to meet. They will be forced to return to the direct donation of federally owned foods which experience has demonstrated is far less effective and efficient. This would be a serious backward step in the national need to make use of our food abundance and the productive capacity of our farmers.

The committee amendment should be rejected.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Missouri yield to me?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

(Mr. FARBSTEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the gentlewoman in the very fine statement she has made in connection with this legislation. For myself, I fail to see the necessity or any good purpose to be served by the committee amendments to the bill. It seems to me every good reason would oppose those two amendments. I shall do all I can to assist the gentlewoman, if she sees fit to do so, to oppose them.

Mr. Chairman, on March 20, the House Committee on Agriculture approved new authorizing legislation for the food stamp program. I wish to ex-

press my support for this basic legislation but more importantly vigorously state my opposition to two amendments which could effectively kill the entire program. The first amendment requires that the States participating in the program pay 20 percent of the cost. I believe this amendment is unjustified and inconsistent with the fundamental purpose of this program.

The Food Stamp Act of 1964 has proven to be one of the most successful national programs in the war against poverty. Its purpose is to increase the food-buying power of low-income persons. It allows needy families in participating programs the opportunity to improve their diet by obtaining more and better food.

The response to this program has exceeded expectations. In 1964, some 351,000 persons were participating in 43 pilot programs in 22 States. By the end of June 1967, the Department of Agriculture estimates that program participation will have grown to 2 million people in 875 programs.

The citizens I have the honor of representing in the 19th Congressional District of New York, have not yet had an opportunity to participate in this program. But last October, New York State requested the program for New York City hoping to begin in July of this year. So I can tell you what this program will mean to the city and subsequently to the poor people of my district.

About 200,000 persons of low income in New York City can expect to be eligible for the food stamp plan. Some estimates of eligible citizens ran as high as 700,000. Taking the more conservative figure of 200,000, one can expect the program to add $10–15 million in purchasing power to these citizens. At this level of participation, the 20-percent State requirement would cost New York State about $4.4 million in additional costs.

On a national level, this 20-percent requirement would cost all the participating States about $40 million a year, at a time when States and local governments are straining to find the financial means to carry out their programs.

As I stated earlier this 20-percent requirement is inconsistent with the intent of the program. The program is designed to help the poor wherever they live by raising their food purchasing power. It is a national program aimed at eliminating a national problem; that of providing a proper diet for needy families.

This is not a give away program, but a participating one which requires poor families to spend for necessary food before Government coupons can be obtained. It is estimated that on the average, a food stamp family investment in the program represents about 64 percent of the total value of the coupons they receive each month. In addition, the program makes use of private food stores by allowing these needy families to buy off the shelf with the participating stores receiving payments from the Government.

Allow me to briefly state my opposition to a second amendment. The Food Stamp Act was passed in 1964 with a 3-year authorization. The bill reported out by the Committee on Agriculture calls for yearly authorization. I cannot emphasize enough the need for a continuing program, one which allows for planning and provides some assurance for poor people that the program will not be open to yearly political maneuvering. The original 1967 administration bill called for an open end authorization. I believe we should give this proposal careful consideration.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the food stamp program has proven to be a success. It has increased the food purchasing power of needy families. The overwhelming participation of States in this program indicates their support. I sincerely urge that all Members of the House, regardless of political parties, give this measure their close attention and hope that they will join me in voting against these crippling amendments.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], who is the chairman of the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. I am a member of that subcommittee, and I want to compliment the gentlewoman for the genuine effort she is making on behalf of the consumers of America. I rise to urge my colleagues to vote against all crippling amendments and to support the gentlewoman by voting "no" on the committee amendment to require the States to pay 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BELCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, this program, of course, while a charity program, really does not reach the people who are most entitled to charity.

Mr. Chairman, every time that this program and its operations move into an area, the commodity program has to move out. The commodity program is for the people who have no other food. The food stamp program is for the person who has food but who does not have a well-balanced diet.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that we should take care of the people who do not have a well-balanced diet. But I do not feel or believe that we should take care of them at the expense of eliminating those people who do not have any funds with which to buy food stamps. If one does not have any money, one cannot purchase food stamps and therefore one cannot participate in this program at all. The person who does not have money and does not have food, in my opinion, should be taken care of first.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons this program is going to escalate rather fast is because that up to the present time—before the Poage amendment was attached to this bill requiring 20-percent participation by the States—the States would certainly certify everyone in the world whom they felt could possibly qualify to participate in this program, because it did not cost the States anything.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion if we require the States to pay or contribute a small part of this program, the States are going to be a little more careful as to whom they certify and people who are actually entitled to participate in the program will receive more of an opportunity to come under its provisions.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that we will not have nearly as many freeloaders if the proposed program is adopted, because if they have to contribute to the extent of paying $1 out of every $5, the States will make sure that these people are actually eligible for participation under the program.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes.

Mr. RESNICK. I feel that the gentleman from Oklahoma must be aware of the Members of the other body making a trip down South not too long ago—it was a bipartisan subcommittee—who found that there were people receiving no food at all under any type program, whether it be the commodity program or the food stamp program.

I am sure further that the gentleman knows this group found people actually suffering from malnutrition, people who were not receiving any food at all.

Now, would not the gentleman agree that if these conditions exist today when States do not have to contribute 20 percent, the condition is going to become that much worse when they have to contribute the prescribed 20 percent as contained in this legislation?

Mr. BELCHER. I would say to the gentleman from New York that under the present program with no participation on the part of the States, the gentleman will find everyone participating in this program, and we will not ever be able to support any other program which takes care of the person who does not have anything.

The reason, in those States that the committee found they were not receiving any kind of food, was because the food stamp plan was in operation in those areas and no other plan was in operation; is that not correct?

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RESNICK. No; I would have to disagree with my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BELCHER. What States were involved?

Mr. RESNICK. I am speaking particularly of the State of Mississippi where there were commodity programs available in some counties and food stamp programs available in other counties. However, under both programs, as it turned out, the State would not certify anyone as being eligible for participation. This condition existed when it was not costing the State anything but the administrative cost involved in the program.

The point I would like to have the gentleman answer if he would, that if in States like these, who are the poorest States, where they are not certifying people when it is not costing them anything, what is going to happen when it starts costing 20 percent as the State's share? That is my question.

Mr. BELCHER. I would say to the gentleman when it starts costing 20 percent, the gentleman can rest assured those people who are certified will be worthy participants. And you are going to find out if this program goes on, like it is now, that there is going to be a scandal among the people who are certified because we will find these rolls loaded down in some of the States, and the food stamp program is going to face a scandal on some of the other aspects of the program.

Mr. RESNICK. I would like to point out, if the gentleman will yield further, that zero minus 20 percent is still zero, and that if these people are not being certified by the States when it is not costing the States anything, then the situation will definitely become much worse.

Mr. BELCHER. I would say to the gentleman that in those States where they do not put the worthy people on the rolls, regardless of whether it costs them any money or not, then I would say I do not believe there is any hope for that State, I do not care what kind of program you have.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has raised the problem about the unrestricted use of food stamps by the States without restriction, and extending the use of the food stamps to many people who are not entitled to them, which is also noted in the gentleman's concern.

However, I would ask the gentleman if it is not true that the gentleman and the committee propose an authorization ceiling on the appropriation as the first limitation the Federal Government would be allowed to expend?

Mr. BELCHER. One hundred and ninety-five million dollars.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not also true that under the proposed new program which the committee has sent to the floor the Secretary of Agriculture retains authority to review the criteria by which the States determine eligibility of the participants under the program. Is that not correct?

Mr. BELCHER. I am not sure about that.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman will find the present law requires the Secretary of Agriculture and the State authorities to agree upon the criteria before they begin making the expenditures, which of course does give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to review the criteria before there is any money expended.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I merely wanted to state that it is my feeling that there is a legitimate right on the part of the House of Representatives and the committee to set some limitations on these programs, which is done by an authorization limitation, and that there is some obligation on the part of the Federal Government to review the criteria established by the States, which is done with the Secretary of Agriculture's concurrence, but I do oppose, as I will state later, this 20-percent requirement which I believe is inappropriate.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. If I understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK], he was referring to the State of Mississippi. These destitute, unfortunate people do not have any money. I would ask the gentleman if they do not have any money then the food stamp program does not do them a bit of good, does it?

Mr. BELCHER. Not at all.

I would say to my good friend, a member of the committee, that we put a limitation of $195 million on this. But, now, let us not kid ourselves into believing that $195 million is going to remain forever, because as these programs are taken up by the States we are going to find people, just like the gentlewoman who spoke earlier and who had been opposed to the bill 2 years ago, but now has changed over and is for it, as these programs are stretched out you are going to find various Members of the House who will discover that the people back home will have found that others have gotten on the gravy train and then they want to get on the bandwagon also. And there will be no limitation to the program, and this program will grow to $2.5 billion. I am sure the gentleman knows that just as I do.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me once more, at this point I would like to comment on this remark. I think the gentleman could raise a valid concern that the States would run away with this program if there were no authorization limitation, and no Appropriation Committee review, or no Secretary of Agriculture to say what the qualifications and criteria should be.

If the Congress wishes to extend the program, that is its own judgment to make. All I am saying to the gentleman, it is not in the power of the States to extend this program without a limitation of their own action. There must be a concurrence of both the Federal and State Government.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MAY. The gentleman, I believe, is referring to my support of this bill this time and I would not want the record to remain, inferring that for political reasons I changed my vote. I think my original position of nonsupport of the bill at that time shows that I spoke in favor of the principle of the food stamp approach as being better than the direct distribution approach and less wasteful. Now with the proper safeguards which were not in the original food stamp program, I am basing my support this year on that and not on any other consideration.

Mr. BELCHER. Then let me ask the gentlewoman this question: Without the 20-percent provision you would not support the bill?

Mrs. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. BELCHER. I think you might find that with respect to a lot of Members.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. I agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma and I would point out that on page 30 of the committee report there is the statement or report of the Library of Congress in response to a letter that I directed to the Library of Congress about Federal participation in other welfare programs.

I think you will find the actual participation by the Federal Government, of course, is 100 percent, spent on this program, and it is going to drop down to 80 percent, but still much higher than any other program.

I can point to the old-age assistance program where the present Federal share estimate for 1968 is about 65 percent.

The aid to families with dependent children, where the present Federal participation in 1968 is estimated to be 56 percent.

The aid to the blind, where the Federal share for 1968 is estimated at 55 percent.

The aid to permanently and totally disabled, where the Federal share in 1968 is estimated to be 64.7 percent.

The medical program, where the Federal share for 1968 is estimated at 53½ percent.

I do not think we are making any drastic change insofar as general welfare programs are concerned and I agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma that if the States do participate, even as low as 20 percent, and I think it should have been 40 percent, there is going to be closer cooperation from people in Mississippi over areas that really need more.

Mr. BELCHER. The gentleman who just spoke offered an amendment providing for 40 percent. There was another amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas and that was reduced to 20 percent.

I think the essential part of it is to make the States partly responsible for this program and you are going to have a much better program and I think it will last a lot longer, and there will be a whole lot less scandals and there will be a more efficiently operated program than if you just turn the thing wide open. The mere fact that Congress gets to review what happens will put no limitation on the funds whatsoever.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. The gentleman has made the suggestion of possible scandals. I wonder if the gentleman is aware of the fact that of the 63,000 stores that have been operating these programs, only

79 out of the 63,000 have been in difficulty because of possible scandals.

I do not think there is another program that is as forthright and as honest in the entire purview of the Federal Government and any State government or municipal government. This program in my opinion, in view of the facts and figures I have just outlined, is the finest and most honest program of any program that the Government has participated in for the moment. In view of the fact that these are the results of a failure or rather where there has been a lack of any State contribution, it is a condition that should be continued. I do not think people should be compelled to go on relief before they can get food stamps, before they can buy food stamps.

Mr. BELCHER. Would the gentleman say that you would rather take care of middle-class people rather than those on relief; and should you not take care of one rather than the other?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I did not say anything about middle-class people. There is a difference between somebody on relief and somebody who is just above relief. Because your school lunch programs of various kinds are distributed to individuals who may not be on relief. These are just those who are on the borderline and I do not think, and at least experience has shown, that a middle-class individual will demean himself in order to take advantage of what amounts to a handout.

Mr. BELCHER. I would say to the gentleman from New York that in view of the fact that the program has been so free of scandal, let us keep it that way.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. That is exactly correct. Let the States stay out of it. Let us not compel the States to contribute, and we will have a good program.

Mr. BELCHER. I would hate to tell the people back home that there would be more scandal when they participated in handling the program than when they can get it for nothing. That does not stand to reason.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RESNICK. The gentleman pointed out, and rightly so, that there are many States and counties where the people do not have money for food stamps at all. As the gentleman will recall, members from both parties in the subcommittee came back outraged at this and asked the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide some aid to these people. The one forum that was felt could provide aid to these people was providing them with food stamps. Again I point out we are not talking about middle class, unless there is middle-class hunger. We are talking about the people who have no food.

The Members came back and suggested that the food stamps be distributed because it was the only way to get their food to those people.

How are we going to accomplish this if a State which has refused to provide anything should be asked to provide 20 percent? I cannot understand that. I certainly wish the gentleman would enlighten me.

Mr. BELCHER. I would say to the gentleman that if this is a good program, not many States would refuse to invest $1 to get a very good State program for their States. If they do, the administration of that State should be changed.

Mr. RESNICK. I disagree with the gentleman. I do not have those powers and neither does the gentleman.

Mr. BELCHER. But I do have the power to make a State administration keep its relief rolls honest, and that is what I intend to do as far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELCHER. I would suggest to the gentleman that he get a little of his own time, for I believe I have been kind in yielding.

Mr. RESNICK. I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation.

Mr. BELCHER. Here is another point we ought to take into consideration before we weep too much about this. The legislation in regard to the 20 percent would not go into effect until July 1, 1969. There will be a long time in which to look at how this program is working before it actually goes into effect in 1969.

I opposed this bill 2 years ago when we passed it. I am opposed to it now. I do not think it is the right type of relief program. I think that in the first place, before you take care of people who already have food and try to give them a better balanced diet, that you first ought to take care of those people who are absolutely hungry and do not have any food whatsoever. Every time that you bring in the food stamp plan you take care of people who have money in their pocket and you absolutely eliminate those who do not have. In any charitable program I have ever known of you first give food to those who are hungry before you take care of the person who does not have a balanced diet.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Why does not the gentleman propose an amendment which would provide for both programs? The gentleman has not offered such an amendment in the committee or on the floor. If he is concerned about the impoverished and that they ought to have food aid and the program should be allowed to continue, why not provide for both programs?

Mr. BELCHER. In the first place, in my opinion we have had a commodity program that has not worked perfectly, most assuredly, but it has fed a whole lot of hungry people. We have had a school lunch program which has fed a whole lot of hungry people. We have had a milk program which has fed many people. If we keep taking on new $2 billion programs, some day there will not be any money for anyone.

In my opinion, with the war on, with money the tightest it has been and with a huge deficit facing us, we should first take care of those people in this country who do not have food before we worry about those who may not have a balanced diet.

Mr. FOLEY. Does the gentleman feel that this country is too poor a country to afford to see that all the people who are in the lower income group have an adequate and nutritious diet? Is that what the gentleman suggests?

Mr. BELCHER. I would say, first, we have to win a war or there will not be any food or anything else for anyone here. In my opinion, second, we have got to take care of those people who have no food whatsoever. Then if we have money enough left after this huge deficit, we can proceed from there.

And another thing: Every single time we adopt one of these programs, it increases the cost of living of every single worker in this country. The cost of living is already pretty high. Maybe we can afford these, but the people who buy groceries I do not believe can afford them.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, not for a statement, but just for a question?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said he voted against this 2 years ago. Two years ago we did not have the problems we are having now in Vietnam. Would the gentleman admit he is against this program, and not use the war in Vietnam as an excuse?

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, we were running a deficit 2 years ago, we were running a deficit 4 years ago, 6 years ago, and 10 years ago, and we are continuing to raise deficits, and the cost of living is continuing to go up every day. We have more inflation, people are paying more taxes than they ever have, and every time we vote an extra dollar out of this House, we just increase the cost of living for those people who are earning their own living and educating their own children. Maybe they do not have a balanced diet, but they are doing what they can by the sweat of their own brow. Every time we take a dollar away from those workers and increase the cost of living to them, we are helping one group, but we are hurting the other.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I have yielded the gentleman from New York about one-third of my time, and I believe that is his quota.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK], 5 minutes for a continuation of his statement.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for having been so courteous in yielding to me, but I believe that is the purpose of this time—to debate the issues and to try to get some answers to some very perplexing questions.

I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma at this time if he would answer this question: If the program is not operating now in the State of Oklahoma, why is it not operating? Would the gentleman not know more about it if it were operating? Is it possible that in the State of Oklahoma they do not know about the program?

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I have been in the Committee of Agriculture for 17 years without knowing about the food stamp plan, because, as the gentlewoman said, 13 years ago

she started talking about it, and I have been hearing about it ever since.

Mr. RESNICK. But it is not operating in the State of Oklahoma, and I would like to ask the gentleman again, if it is not operating in Oklahoma today, when it would not cost the State of Oklahoma anything, except the cost of the food stamps——

Mr. BELCHER. No, sir.

Mr. RESNICK. If the gentleman will permit me to finish my sentence, I would like to say that if the State of Oklahoma, the great State of Oklahoma, is not participating today when it does not cost anything, what is going to happen when this program costs 20 percent? I would say further, surely the great State of Oklahoma and its distinguished Representatives do not put the State of Oklahoma in the same economic class as some of our Southern States, where people are actually going hungry.

Mr. BELCHER. Yes; but they are going hungry because they have the food stamp program and do not have the commodity program, and there is no way for them to get anything to eat. In Oklahoma we have kept the commodity program to take care of those people who are actually poor, and we have not taken care of those people who would just want a little better diet. We have taken care of first things first in Oklahoma.

By the way, the gentleman says it does not cost anything. I would have the gentleman know we pay a great deal of income tax to the Federal Government, and we in Oklahoma know that the things from Congress and from the Federal Government do not come like a free lunch.

Mr. RESNICK. I thank the gentleman for his observations. I would like now to make a few of my own.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has on several occasions referred to the "Southern States" disparagingly. I wonder if the gentleman is not aware that there have been reports even in the press of this Nation and not from some self-seeking and self-appointed commission or committee which on its own undertook to dig into some kind of scandals, to the effect that even in the great city of New York and other great cities of the North that there are people who sometimes go hungry.

Mr. RESNICK. I would say to the gentleman that I do not like to use generic terms like "the South." I could name the States in particular: Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina.

I would say to the gentleman that we in the North know we do have shortcomings. This is the reason why we are backing the food stamp program for all we can, to try to eliminate these shortcomings.

The problems we face, I say to my distinguished chairman, include the one that there are States not trying to help these poor and destitute people.

I am sure the gentleman would agree with me that food is not a luxury, but if we listened to the gentleman from Oklahoma one would get the impression that we were putting out these stamps for liquor or TV sets or automobiles.

This is for food. We are trying to feed people.

I say to the gentleman that I, in my study, have learned that the problem is not alone with the States, but also with the individual counties. In some States, such as in Mississippi, some counties will feed their poor and other counties will not.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The statements to which the gentleman has referred are from a self-appointed commission which set out to prove certain facts and announced what they were going to prove before they got any evidence. I just wonder if that kind of self-serving evidence is the best the gentleman can produce here.

I do not live east of the Mississippi River. I live a long ways west of the States the gentleman named. I do not believe my State is any better or any worse than the average State on this score. There are hungry people in Texas, and there are well-fed people in Texas. By and large, we try to do a good job in Texas. I am sure that the people of New York State try to care for their needy, but it is still possible to find hungry people there if you go looking for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

I would hope that the gentleman, rather than attack certain sections of our country, would seek to improve the conditions in those sections and recognize that there is some evil in all sections of the country.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I do not have much time, and I cannot yield to the gentleman unless he will yield me some time.

Mr. BELCHER. I yielded about one-third of my time to the gentleman previously, but I will yield an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. The gentleman admits that the State of New York has some shortcomings. I believe that one of the greatest shortcomings it has had is not being willing to pay 20 percent of the 100 percent of the bill to take care of the people of that State. I expect that is one of the greatest shortcomings the State would have.

Mr. RESNICK. I have to disagree with the gentleman.

I point out to the gentleman once again that we are talking about food. Anyone who reads the RECORD tomorrow morning and pays attention to the remarks would get the impression that food is some sort of luxury. If anyone overseas were to read this debate he would be amazed that here in the great land of plenty we are debating whether or not to provide food for hungry people.

I point out that this is basically what we are saying. Are we going to vote for this and provide some people who ordinarily would be hungry or would have inadequate diets a decent standard of eating, or are we going to say, "No. We made ours. You make yours."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I should like to state some facts about food from the latest report I have, which is January 1967. This report states that the commodity distribution program in the State of Mississippi is now distributing direct food, free food, to 69 counties of Mississippi, while only 14 of the counties have the food stamp program. So the people are being distributed food under the direct distribution program in those 69 counties.

Mr. RESNICK. I thank the gentlewoman.

I should like to use the remainder of my time to point out to my distinguished chairman that I did not get up here to start the Civil War all over again. The fact remains that certain of our Southern States are not taking advantage of this program. They simply refuse to face their responsibilities. They place the responsibility directly at the doorstep of the Federal Government. If they cannot afford the stamps when they are free how can they afford to pay 20 percent of the cost?

Then, when the Federal Government does not have the tools to work with this, the Federal Government winds up being blamed for hungry people in this great United States. These are the facts.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. Yes. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DOLE. I am wondering: Do you feel the States share a responsibility at all in the food stamp program?

Mr. RESNICK. I certainly do. They share the responsibility to get it distributed, and they are not even doing that.

Mr. DOLE. Who do you want to pay for that?

Mr. RESNICK. No. I just point out that the situation is bad enough now. Let us not aggravate it any more. If the great State of South Carolina cannot distribute food stamp when they are not costing anything, then what is going to happen to the poor people of the great State of South Carolina when it costs them 20 percent?

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, when I listen to the debate I begin to think that we no longer have any food programs in the United States. Let me just very briefly quote from a statement of the Secretary of Agriculture on March 3, 1967:

> Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman reported today that U.S. Department of Agriculture food assistance programs were available to needy people and schoolchildren in more communities during the first half of fiscal 1967 (July–December 1966) than during the same period a year earlier.
>
> At the end of December 1966, 1,498 counties and 114 cities were distributing USDA

foods to needy families. In addition, USDA's Food Stamp Program functioned in another 477 areas. In the same month of 1965, the Secretary said, foods were being distributed in 1,606 counties and 247 cities, while the Food Stamp Program was available in 191 areas.

At this time we have in force a commodity distribution program. The Comptroller General of the United States made a survey in three counties in Pennsylvania recently. I would like to read from this report. This is a report submitted by the Comptroller General to the Congress of the United States in February 1967:

We found evidence which indicated that 37, 40, and 32 percent of the families respectively were ineligible to receive commodities primarily because their incomes or available resources exceeded the limitations established by the States. In addition we found 15 families or 7 percent of the 225 families in the three counties received more commodities than they were entitled to because reductions in family size had not been reported.

Then the report goes on to say:

Because of these irregularities the cost to the Federal Government over a 3-month period ran between $182,000 and $602,000.

I think we can expect the same irregularities will probably prevail under the food stamp program.

We are told over and over again that our gross national product is at an alltime high. I do not think that anybody can deny that. We are also told it will probably go higher. We are also told that unemployment is at an alltime low. Now, how can we support any program that will expand public assistance programs when these things prevail; namely, when our gross national product is at an alltime high and our unemployment rate is at an alltime low? I am very, very much interested in a report that was given to us in the committee. This report lists, State by State, the amount of money that the various States will receive under this proposed program.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anyone in the Congress of the United States is willing to admit that the States of Ohio and Pennsylvania are among the poorer States. We talk about the State of Mississippi and how badly off they are. Well, personally, I am not willing to admit that Pennsylvania, at least, is in that condition today, and I do not believe that the boys from Ohio are willing to admit that the State of Ohio is in the same position.

Mr. Chairman, yet under this program—and I hope all the members of the Committee will pay attention to these figures—poor Ohio is to receive $18,363,000, and the next poorest State, the State of Pennsylvania, is supposed to receive $15,487,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, how can one justify a thing like that? Personally, I cannot.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct the gentleman's attention to a letter which I have just received from Gov. James A. Rhodes, of the State of Ohio. Here is what the Governor says:

I am writing to express my concern over H.R. 1318, the Food Stamp Authorization Bill of 1967. The measure was amended by the House Agriculture Committee to limit the Food Stamp Program to a 1-year extension and to require participating States to contribute 20 percent of the bonus value of the stamps distributed.

Under the existing law, the Food Stamp Program is funded entirely by the Federal Government. Requiring 20 percent State participation would result in severely curtailing, if not terminating the Food Stamp Program in Ohio. Several million dollars would be involved.

More than 175,000 Ohioans in twenty-three of our State's twenty-four Congressional Districts presently participate in the program. The continuation of its benefits for these people is at stake. I urge you to oppose these amendment and support the continuation of the existing food stamp program should H.R. 1318 come to the House floor.

Mr. Chairman, it is my information that over $3 million would be involved in additional expense to the State of Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the Governor of Ohio makes it very clear that insofar as he is concerned, the food stamp program in the State of Ohio is in jeopardy of termination if the State is compelled to contribute 20 percent of the cost of the food stamp program.

There is no likelihood that Ohio would contribute in excess of $3 million in order to participate. Therefore, I am afraid that we would be cut out of this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODLING. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. As I interpret the letter of the Governor of Ohio, the State of Ohio would be cut out of the program if it were compelled to come up with another $3.5 million.

Mr. GOODLING. In other words, the gentleman from Ohio is saying that the State of Ohio would not be willing to pay 20 percent in order to continue its participation in this program?

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am telling the gentleman that the present Governor of Ohio, James A. Rhodes, says that the State of Ohio would not be likely to support it.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to report to the Committee that I have received no such letter from the Governor of California, Governor Reagan, to this effect.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, perhaps Governor Reagan has not been advised about this situation by the finance director of Ohio, who as I understand it, frequently provides him with financial advice.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield further to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Governor Reagan is a man who has a high sense of fiscal responsibility. He does not expect the Federal Government to assume 100 percent of welfare costs. If the State of California chooses to participate in this program, I am confident it will expect to pay part of the cost.

Mr. GOODLING. I might say that recently I received a telegram, or a letter, from the secretary of public assistance in Pennsylvania, and he told me that it would work a hardship upon the State of Pennsylvania to pay this proposed 20 percent.

I wrote back and told him I thought that was just too bad, that the State of Pennsylvania could not pay 20 percent of this food stamp program, and I did not think it deserved very much consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to close by saying what I said previously: I, personally, cannot support the expansion of a public assistance program at a time when our gross national product is at an alltime high and at a time when our unemployment rate is at an alltime low.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GOODLING. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I can readily and easily understand how the Governor of a State would be glad to receive as much money from Washington with which to take care of his own relief bill costs in order that he can expend it on something else.

I can readily understand why the Governor would be inclined to obtain from Washington as much as he can.

But, Mr. Chairman, those of us who represent the national interest must realize that consideration must be given to the national budget and that we should have some consideration for the national budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I feel that we, as national legislators, have some responsibility to see to it that these programs are partially paid for by the participating States.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODLING. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I note here that there are 13 States where local governments finance the certification of the issuance cost. So, this, perhaps, may explain why we have not heard from these 13 States, which include the State of California.

Mr. BELCHER. I presume if California is like Oklahoma, they would like to take care of the poor people first.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this time to tell the Committee a little bit about the effect of this program in my area. As a matter of fact, the food stamp program is just about the only benefit from the agricultural programs of this country that flow directly to, and have some effect upon, the people in my community.

Mr. Chairman, we were late in my community in getting into the food stamp program. We entered this program on May 1, 1963. This program at first was only a pilot program. We now consider it one of the most important and most successful endeavors of the Federal Government. We believe we have done more to fight poverty with the food stamp program than any other Federal program.

In our community, nearly $19 million in free or bonus stamps have been used to purchase food in our county since the beginning of the program. That is more Federal assistance than all the other poverty programs involved in my area. But unlike other programs which may not directly reach the poor, this money through the stamp program has been carefully directed in my area to the people who are in need—some 18,000 families living on public assistance, and 1,500 low-income families. This money has been used in the satisfaction of basic human needs. It has not been a giveaway program, because the people involved have had to purchase with their own money, or out of their public assistance grants, the stamps in order to be eligible for these free or bonus coupons.

Mr. Chairman, through food stamps, the poor in my community have been able to increase their food purchases by over 25 percent. This program has meant more food, milk, fresh meats, fresh vegetables to the people in the poverty areas of my community. This is the first program that combines aid to the poor with sound nutrition. This program uses the regular channels of distribution, that is, the supermarkets or the grocery stores. In my community we would suffer a tragic loss if this program were discontinued.

By the tenor of our Governor's letter, it appears quite obvious that he is not about to financially support the food stamp program. The State of Ohio is not about to provide the money this bill would require. In Ohio, the 20 percent participation would require $3.5 million in State revenues to make possible the continuation of this program.

Mr. Chairman, this program is the first program which has recognized that 75 percent of the people of poverty in my community were not on public assistance. We have been able to use food stamps in many cases of temporary need where families have not had immediate access to public assistance, where there was a short-term need, and where a sack full of groceries would tide the family over. We were just beginning in our program to extend these benefits to the senior citizens who are in need.

In my area for the month of March of this year 17,836 families, or 64,248 persons, were direct beneficiaries participating in this program, from the roles of those eligible for aid for the aged, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, aid to dependent children of the unemployed, and on relief.

Mr. Chairman, in my county since this program has gone into effect, there have been 766,644 cases served. The bonuses since the program went into effect on May 1, 1963, have totaled over $18 million, with a total stamp value of almost $50 million.

I say to the Members of this Committee that this is a program which is absolutely essential in urban areas such as in the city of Cleveland, where we have such a high concentration of unemployed people. Today there are over 26,000 people in my community who are on the rolls of the jobless. This is more than our community can support without the help of the food stamp program.

The food stamp program has been a vital factor in this effort to serve these needs. For 12 years I have voted in the House of Representatives in favor of and I have supported farm legislation. The only reason, looking back, that I can see to justify my support of agricultural programs is the food stamp program that you are threatening to destroy today. I say to you that if this proposal to make the States contribute 20 percent is passed today, it will be the end of the food stamp program in my community. It will be the end of the program in the State of Ohio. I think the consequences of any such action must rest with the Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK]. I agree with the principles that he has just set forth. I, too, coming from a completely rural community have continuously and regularly supported all of the farm programs because I believe that they are in the best interests of our country, and in the direction of stabilizing the farm economy and the income of the farmers. This is one place where the people who have benefited as a result of this program through the years, and as a result of votes cast by myself and the gentleman from Ohio and those who believe as we do, can perhaps reciprocate by taking care of some of the people whom their surplus products are going to feed in our great cities.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a discussion by several Members of the House about the costs of the food stamp program.

I just want to say that the Department of Agriculture spent $134 million last year on the direct distribution program, which represented just the value of the commodities that were distributed free. The food stamp program did not cost that much. In the gentleman's own State of Ohio there are still 33 counties getting free distribution of food. In Oklahoma, while they have no food stamps, there are 73 counties in Oklahoma getting food distributed free. Apparently Oklahoma prefers the free handout system to the food stamps.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman, but I would like to have it understood that as of this time we have yielded more than half of the time of the majority to those who are opposed to the bill on this side. We have already yielded more than 30 minutes of that time. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I want to take this time to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, for his very forthright statement, and to say that I agree with him completely.

Our situation in Illinois is that our legislature is now meeting and it will adjourn by law on June 30. It will not be in session again until 1969; therefore there are hundreds of thousands of people in Illinois who are now receiving food stamps who would have to go off the rolls if this amendment, as proposed by the committee, is adopted, because the legislature does not get down to business before the second quarter of the year.

I agree with the gentleman and congratulate him for his very forthright statement, and hope the House will reject the 20-percent cash requirement from the States.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, that this 20-percent provision does not go into effect until July 1, 1969, after his legislature has had an opportunity to meet.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], my friend, I want to make sure I understood what the gentleman said. I am not sure I heard the gentleman correctly. I thought the gentleman mentioned the figure of $50 million being spent on this program in his congressional district.

Mr. VANIK. No; what I said was that since this program came into effect and since it has been established in my community in Cuyahoga County, which began on May 1, 1963, through April 30, 1967, we had 766,644 cases, and stamps bought by people totaled $30,250,000 and the bonuses amounted to $18,759,000, so that the total stamp value purchased including what was given and what was bought totaled almost $50 million in my own county during this period of time.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. If that were multiplied by the 435 congressional districts in this country, if my mathematics are correct, it would amount to a little matter of $21,750 million—so this is not a peanuts program.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I want to point out that the figures I got represent more than my own district. They represent four congressional districts which constitute the metropolitan area.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I see. That would reduce it to perhaps $8 billion, but that is still quite a lot of money, and it is about the estimate we have been given.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state at the onset of my remarks that, while I am wholeheartedly in favor of the food stamp program, I am firm in my opposition to the 20-percent provision we are being asked to pile on top of the present State and local welfare costs.

I think it is well that we remind ourselves today that the action we take—and the decisions we reach—can have a very personal effect on the day-to-day lives of individual people and families. I was reminded of this when I read an article in the Wall Street Journal of September 30, 1966. The article written by Kenneth G. Slocum and entitled, "Feeding the Poor," deals largely with the operation of the food stamp program in Kentucky.

He begins the article with the following report of an interview:

"I can load as much coal as any man alive," says lean, 57-year-old Maryland Collins. "But I can't raise a family of young-uns on three days work and $35 a week." So Mr. Collins, who has spent his whole life here in the Cumberland Mountains, counts heavily on help from Federal food stamps that can be used like cash at the grocery store. Gesturing at his neatly dressed eight-year-old boy, he says: "This one would still be eating bread and gravy for breakfast instead of eggs, milk and cereal if it weren't for those food stamps."

The day-to-day change, or more specifically, this meal-to-meal change in this family's livelihood was brought about because we in the Congress considered and decided on a question of national significance.

I will quote from some additional personal interviews, but because of the length of the article I will not read it all. It is well done, and I do not think its objectivity should be suspect by those who might normally oppose this kind of program.

The article continues:

"My kids eat better than they ever did and it shows—they have more life and they're brighter," exclaims Ernest Sexton, 46, who has seven children ranging from 2 to 15.

Comments Jessie Colter, a six-foot, 198-pound Knott County constable who gets a salary of $75 a month: "It's the kids who benefit most. Where my two ate rice before, we now can feed them far more fresh milk, fresh eggs and meat." Mr. Colter pays $30 monthly and receives enough stamps to buy $64 worth of food.

The author reports on the results of a blood analysis survey conducted by a county welfare department which confirms that food stamps have improved the health of local welfare clients.

I reiterate that this improvement in the day-to-day lives of the poor results from a broad national question decided here. Here we speak of 2 million participants, but back home it is food on the table for the Smith family, a supper of chicken for an elderly couple, and a new alertness for a child in school.

We considered requiring State and local financing of the bonus coupons in 1964—and we defeated it. We did so because we were convinced it would mean the program would not be financially feasible to those very areas that need it most. That was a wise decision and because of it, over one-third of the 300 lowest per capita income counties in this Nation are a part of this program.

Do not be misled by this cost-sharing provision. What we are really considering here is not cost sharing, but individual meals for individual people. If this provision becomes law, we might just as well repeal the program because it will not operate with it. A vote for or against this provision is, in fact, a vote for or against the better nutrition made possible by the food stamp program.

I urge that the amendments incorporated into the bill by the House Agriculture Committee be stricken and that the food stamp program be continued as it is now operating.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I followed with great interest the hearings and markup sessions on the extension of the food stamp bill. I would agree with some Members that there should be some restrictions on the extent to which this program is expanded, especially if it were to be possible to expand it merely by State action. But the fact is, and an important fact here, that the committee has reported a bill which would provide for an authorization for 1 year and a limitation on appropriations. That is one protection.

A second protection is that the Secretary of Agriculture must approve the criteria for any State participation. That is the second protection.

The second amendment that is offered by the committee is an amendment to provide a 20-percent contribution by the States. That is an improper and wrong approach in limiting any possible excesses of this program, because it does not really attack what the gentlemen say is a matter of their concern—the extension of costs. What it does attack is the application of the program in the States that need it most.

This program has been successful; I would remind the Committee that many statements have been made on the floor today that the program has been one of the most successful, least troublesome, least subject to any improprieties of any Federal program in existence, and not one Member has challenged that statement.

On the contrary, the alternative program championed by the gentleman from Oklahoma was attacked a few minutes ago by his colleague from Pennsylvania on the basis that the Comptroller General of the United States had some question about the operation of specific commodity distribution programs. That is the very alternative that is being supported and espoused by the gentleman from Oklahoma, the ranking member of the committee.

There is nothing in this bill that would prevent any State or locality from choosing between a commodity distribution program and a food stamp program.

The vice of the second committee amendment is that it would choose for the States, it would choose for these localities, by putting a 20-percent burden on those States that would choose the food stamp program, where no such requirement is made in the food distribution program.

If the committee had come forward with an amendment to provide a 20-percent contributing share in the food distribution program as well as in the food stamp program, I could say that its position was consistent. But the direction of the second committee amendment is not to improve the food stamp program operation, not to provide sharing by the States, but to cripple its operation and to destroy it. The amendment is the wedge to discourage those States and localities from using food stamps.

What are we dealing with, ladies and gentlemen? We are dealing with food, with nutrition for needy families. I suggest to my friends on both sides of the aisle who claim to be conservatives—and I think that is a proud title—that we have heard complaints for many years, and I have shared these complaints—that some families receiving welfare assistance have occasionally used funds that they receive for unnecessary or improper purposes, at least not for the basic needs of the family. This is a program designed to encourage people on public assistance and to utilize those funds for food, for the nutrition of their own families. And at once there becomes a terrible danger of scandal. What scandal? Not that families will spend funds for luxuries or liquor but that funds will be used for food.

I would suggest, ladies and gentlemen, that a young person raised in a family of need who gets a chance for a healthy and nutritious diet and who has an opportunity for an education and a few other opportunities may not be a welfare parent himself, and this is the best kind of conservatism.

This is the kind of investment in people that is going to make a difference 10 years from now, and 20 years from now, in what proportion of our national income we will be devoting to public assistance purposes. It is an investment in nutrition in support of American families, inviting them to help themselves and advance their children to self-sufficient and contributing citizenship.

I strongly urge all Members of this Committee to act to eliminate this

travagance in the administration or conduct of this program?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri that I am 67 years old and that I have been watching human nature all my life and that I do not have to have anyone testify to the effect that people will spend other people's money much more readily than they will spend funds to which they have to contribute even a small part themselves. In other words, if they have to put up 20 cents out of every dollar the States are going to take a pretty good look at the administration of this program, and that statement goes just as well for the great State of Texas as it does for the State of Missouri from which the gentlewoman comes. That is also true of any other State in the Union.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the provision to require 20-percent financial participation by the States contained in the amended version of H.R. 1318 to extend the Food Stamp Act, as reported by the House Agriculture Committee.

To enjoy the benefits of the food-stamp program as it presently operates, States and localities are required to pay administrative costs, including certification of eligible families and coupon issuance and accounting. Such costs typically run to about 7 percent of the value of the Federal "bonus." Thus, Wisconsin sources, for instance, will be contributing some $90,000 to the program in fiscal 1967. Requiring an additional 20 percent State contribution in the future might well mean cancellation of the program in Wisconsin and other States.

I have watched the food-stamp program since it started. It is one of the finest programs the Federal Government has sponsored for the benefit of low-income families.

To the some 25,000 low-income people in 22 Wisconsin counties now using food stamps, the program means an opportunity to shop for foods of their choice with dignity.

At present and anticipated levels of operation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that the total value of "bonus" food coupons issued to Wisconsin participants this fiscal year will reach $1.3 million, compared to some $642,000 in fiscal 1966 when 13 counties had programs. One more county—Adams—has been designated for the program this year, to bring the State's total to 23 food-stamp counties.

In order to assure that this worthwhile program is permitted to continue in Wisconsin and other States, the 20-percent provision should be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to call upon the Members of Congress to continue the food-stamp program as it was originally adopted in 1964. The food-stamp program is an outgrowth of a pilot program, tested and proved successful in every respect, in 43 divergent areas of this Nation. It has been judiciously expanded to more than 600 areas and further gradual expansion is contemplated under this authorization.

The proposed change in this program—the requirement that localities pick up the tab for 20 percent of the bonus coupons—has been termed a crippling amendment. It is more than that. It is, in fact, a death sentence.

Its adoption most certainly would return hungry families to the dole of surplus commodity foods.

Experience has shown us that the present program is the most efficient way to move more nutritious food to more deserving people of any method yet devised. It helps hungry adults and children. It has the overwhelming support of the food industry—from the farmer to the grocery store. It has won the praise of our banking industry and welfare officials. It has improved health and the economy in every area where it operated.

In spite of this efficiency and acceptance, the one local criticism that is heard of the program is that it is presently too expensive. The very areas which need this program the most are those areas which can least afford the cost of the present program. Yet, these impoverished areas, under enlightened local leadership, are making the sacrifice to finance the program and many more have requested assistance. Others are waiting—attempting to find ways of financing it. Still others find the cost prohibitive under present circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members of the Committee that it makes no sense to say to these areas—already in desperate straits—that we are going to triple and quadruple the cost to the locality. It will spell the end of this program. It will result in the return to the dole.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of H.R. 1318, as originally introduced by our distinguished colleague, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and I urge the elimination of the Agriculture Committee's amendment requiring State matching.

The food-stamp plan is operating successfully in Tarrant County, Tex., part of which is in my congressional district, and I am well acquainted with the self-help features of the program.

Approval of this particular committee amendment could for all practical purposes kill the program, inasmuch as it is far from certain that any State is in a position to assume the additional budgetary requirements of the 20-percent State participation provision. Therefore, I urge the elimination of the 20-percent cost-sharing amendment.

This will permit the continuation of a worthwhile program which cannot be termed a handout. It should be emphasized that, under the food-stamp plan as it now functions, participants purchase approximately two-thirds of the stamps required to obtain adequate food for their diet and receive approximately one-third as a bonus.

Thousands of needy Texans are eating better, and retail food sales are increasing since Federal food stamps first were used in Tarrant County in 1965.

For example, when the food-stamp program opened in Pecos County, Ray Martinez of the Texas Department of Public Welfare said:

> This is just like a new business coming into the community, for it will increase the food buying power of low-income families, and, in turn, will increase retail business and create more jobs.

Experience also reveals that the eligible persons under the program are eating more nutritious meals. Through the purchase of food coupons, the eligible housewife is able to add an average of about 35 percent to funds allowed for food by local welfare department budgets.

She has relative freedom in spending the coupons, and the cushion they provide can make the difference between adequate nutrition and bare subsistence. The coupon plan gives participants a freedom of choice in what they eat and where they buy it that is impossible under the older Federal program through which federally owned foods, mostly surplus staples, are distributed to the needy on an as-available basis.

Not only does the program help the needy get more nutritional diets, but also "it places the distribution of commodities back into the normal channel which is extremely important if the free enterprise system is to be maintained," according to the Texas Wholesale Grocers Association.

R. J. Lewallen, executive vice president of the association, said that the food-stamp program is the only available method to see that underprivileged Americans are properly fed. He further expresses the concern that any additional cost to the State would detract from other services provided to the needy by the State.

During the past month, some 10,000 low-income persons enjoyed the benefits of more adequate diets with the help of food stamps in 10 Texas counties: Brewster, Culberson, El Paso, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis, Pecos, Presidio, Red River, Tarrant and Terrell. Currently the participants are receiving some $65,000 per month in "bonus" food coupons from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to be added to their own normal food expenditures.

At present and anticipated levels of operation of the food-stamp program, USDA estimates that the total Federal "bonus" coupons flowing into the 10 Texas counties' economies this fiscal year may exceed $590,000 in value.

It is a good program and it is working, and it seems unwise to put it in jeopardy by the requirement of State matching. This requirement, in careless or recalcitrant States, could in effect stop the program.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the food-stamp program is a success by any standards yet we are being asked here today to destroy it.

If we pass H.R. 1318 in the form in which it was reported by the House Committee on Agriculture there can be no other result.

The ill-conceived committee amendment which would require 20-percent State participation certainly would terminate the program in California and in all likelihood all of the 40 participating States.

In California it would be necessary for the State to allocate $1,585,334 in order to continue the program at the present level. In Los Angeles County alone $975,009 would be required in matching funds.

Now all of us who read the newspapers are aware of the difficulties which have

been experienced by Governor Reagan with his budget. It is inconceivable to me that he would ask the legislature for $1.5 million to keep this program going.

The ultimate result is obvious—the 80,727 poor people in Los Angeles County who are being afforded a better, more nutritious diet would no longer be able to participate in the program.

To my colleagues who oppose the food-stamp plan I wish to state that this is no "give away" program.

It is a self-help program in the strictest sense of the term. I wish to emphasize that those participating must pay for approximately two-thirds of the stamps which they receive and in turn they receive approximately one-third as a bonus.

I urge rejection of the House Agriculture Committee's amendments and the passage of the bill as originally introduced by Mrs. SULLIVAN.

A sampling of report in the California press demonstrated approval of this successful program as it now exists.

Newspapers from Modoc County in the north to Los Angeles and Pasadena in the south have made favorable comments on the program, the extension of which is in jeopardy here today.

The Los Angeles Times, for example, on September 8, 1966, carried a column by Dr. F. J. Stare, Department of Nutrition, Harvard University, which is headlined "United States Helps Needy Gain Nutrition." Among Dr. Stare's comments are these:

Food stamp families have made significant increases in the value of foods used and 80 percent of the increase is attributed to meat, poultry, fish, milk, eggs, fruits and vegetables. The participants have better diets than nonparticipants of the same income level.

In one area, 48 percent of the participating families had diets meeting National Research Recommended Dietary Allowances as compared with 29 percent before the plan. Health workers and school officials think they have observed general improvement in the health of the children.

On August 30, 1965, the San Jose Mercury commented editorially:

The (Food Stamp) Plan has a good deal to recommend it and unless the supervisors find compelling reasons to the contrary, it probably should be put into effect here.

Santa Clara County, of which San Jose is the county seat, has been designated by the Department of Agriculture for participation in the near future.

The Pasadena Independent in a December 20, 1965, editorial stated:

In its humanitarian purposes the program is highly commendable. It goes beyond a dole or a handout by making help available to those persons who cannot provide all of the vital necessities of life yet are willing to go part of the way in helping themselves.

In December 1965 the Contra Costa Labor Journal carried a story with the headline "Food-Stamp Program Starts—Low-Paid Workers Can Benefit" following the inauguration of the program in Contra Costa County. The then California State Welfare Director J. M. Wedemeyer was quoted at some length on the value of the county's participation in the program.

Wedemeyer also is quoted in the August 20, 1965, Food Mart News as terming the food-stamp plan the most significant advance ever made toward meeting the food budget problems of low-income families. He said:

It enables such families to increase the buying power of their limited food budget dollars by as much as 50 percent.

The Modoc County Record on March 2, 1967, carried a story headlined "'Best Move Possible' Says State Head of Food-Stamp Program" in which the State administrator of the program, Fen Hildreth, called participation by Modoc County "unquestionably the wisest, most economical move your county can make in administering aid to needy."

Mary Tobin, a columnist in the San Francisco Examiner and Chronicle, devoted considerable comment to the program on October 16, 1966. She stated:

It is important to understand that Food Stamps are not a hand-out. Not charity. In dollars and cents they are an investment in human beings. Inadequate diet is recognized as a major cause of poor health among families with low incomes. The Food Stamp Program is a new method of helping low-income and welfare-aided families "help themselves" to better diets. And better health.

In spite of the success of the program in California, its future is in doubt. A requirement of 20 percent financial participation by the States would in all likelihood bring about cancellation of the program in California, which is beset with budget problems. Such a provision is contained in the bill to extend the Food Stamp Act, as reported by the House Agriculture Committee, and it should be stricken when the bill is considered in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year" and substituting therefor "and for each subsequent fiscal year such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 5, strike out lines 5 through 9 and insert in lieu there of the following: the word "and" the first time it appears therein and by inserting after the word "1967;" the words "not in excess of $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968;"

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1318) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members shall have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks during the general debate on the bill H.R. 1318.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING FIGHTING MEN IN VIETNAM

(Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Missouri Federation of Women's Democratic Clubs of the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri recently held a convention in which they adopted a resolution expressing support of our young men fighting for freedom in Vietnam and elsewhere and reaffirming their support of their able Congressman, the Honorable RICHARD H. ICHORD.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this resolution:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, this Missouri Federation of Women's Democratic Clubs of the 8th Congressional District of Missouri has previously, in conventions assembled, gone on record in support and commendation of our great Democratic Federal and State officials, and also our capable and renowned Congressional Representative Honorable Richard H. Ichord; and

Whereas, this 8th District Federation of Women's Democratic Clubs is proud to have contributed so many Democratic women leaders to the work of our great party in their communities and counties, our nation and state, and we would especially commend Mrs. Sallie Bailey, of Saline County, National Committeewoman; Mrs. Ruby Jane Happy, of Cole County, State Director of the Department of Business and Administration and State President of the Missouri Federated Women's Democratic Clubs; Mrs. Mary Lozier, formerly of Cole County, Member of the Missouri State Council on the Arts and Immediate Past-President of our State Federation of Women's Democratic Clubs; Mrs. Alice Moore, Assistant Supervisor of Safety Responsibility, Department of Revenue of Missouri and President of the Jefferson Democratic Women's Club of Cole County; Mrs. Jean Casey, of Washington County, Executive Secretary of the State Board of Cosmetology, and Mrs. Rubye M. Kocher, of Cole County, Supervisor of Corporation Franchise Tax, Department of Revenue of Missouri; and

Whereas, this 8th District Federation of Women's Democratic Clubs, here assembled at the Holiday Inn on the Lake of the Ozarks, in the heart of Missouri's beautiful Vacationland, appreciates the efforts and time expended by the hostess club, Camco, of Camden County, in the preparation and arrangements for the comfort and enjoyment of our officers, delegates and guests; and

Whereas, on the fields of battle abroad, and especially Vietnam, war has claimed the lives of many of our citizens and especially our youth, others are fighting presently, and many more are preparing to join the Fight for Freedom in the world.

Now, therefore, be it resolved: That this Spring 1967 Convention of the Missouri Federation of Women's Democratic Clubs of the

amendment, which is invalid, inappropriate, and a dangerous limitation on a successful program, one that has no relation to proper concerns of cost or proper operation of this most humane, and efficient, I believe, of recent Government programs for the assistance of American families.

I compliment the gentlewoman from Missouri for sponsorship and unfailing support of the program.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add just a few remarks.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Thirty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 89]

Abernethy	Fulton, Tenn.	Nedzi
Ashbrook	Gardner	Nix
Ashley	Giaimo	Passman
Barrett	Goodell	Pool
Bingham	Green, Oreg.	Pucinski
Blatnik	Green, Pa.	Purcell
Bow	Hagan	Reinecke
Button	Halpern	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Hansen, Idaho	Rodino
Cabell	Hansen, Wash.	Ronan
Cahill	Hawkins	Rooney, Pa.
Carey	Hays	Rostenkowski
Celler	Helstoski	Roybal
Clark	Holifield	Ruppe
Collier	Holland	Sandman
Conte	Howard	Satterfield
Conyers	Jacobs	St Germain
Corbett	Jones, Mo.	St. Onge
Cowger	King, N.Y.	Schneebeli
Culver	Kleppe	Shipley
Davis, Wis.	Kluczynski	Shriver
Delaney	Laird	Sisk
Dellenback	Lloyd	Smith, Iowa
Dent	McDade	Snyder
Diggs	McEwen	Stanton
Dulski	McMillan	Steed
Dwyer	Macdonald, Mass.	Tiernan
Edwards, La.	MacGregor	Tuck
Eilberg	Machen	Tunney
Everett	Madden	Watkins
Fino	Meeds	Whalley
Fisher	Morgan	Williams, Miss.
Flood	Morton	Willis
Flynt	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyatt
Ford, William D.	Myers	Wydler
		Younger

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 1318, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 331 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentlewoman from Missouri, I have several questions that I should like to ask for my own clarification.

Do I correctly understand that the local officials in a State determine those who are eligible to receive aid under the food stamp program?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is correct.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Is the authority to determine those eligible looked over by the Secretary of Agriculture and the appropriate State authorities?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I do not believe that the Secretary of Agriculture could go into the details about an individual, but if the community or the county wants to enter into a food stamp program, they apply to the director of welfare of their State, and the director of welfare applies to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. It has been alleged that in at least one large city, just prior to an anticipated strike, the food stamp officials called the local union officials and asked for a list of those going on strike, or the union members, so that preliminary work could be done in respect to those individuals going on strike so that could get aid under the food stamp program. My question, without arguing pro or con whether that is good or bad, is simply this: Is that permissible under the food stamp program? Does the Government consider that a person who is on strike is eligible?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would say to the gentleman, if he will yield further, that, yes, if such a person meets the income qualifications set up for that State under that program, that individual would be able to qualify whether he was on strike or not, depending on his income and the assets of the family.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. At the given time?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. At the given time.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. In other words, assuming that the individual makes adequate income while working and would not be eligible, if by placing himself on strike, whatever the purpose of the strike, he then takes his income level down to a level which would make him eligible, he would then receive Government aid in the form of food stamps?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes. For the State of Alabama the resources would have to be four times the monthly scale. So if they qualify——

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. You are going to have to talk a little more in layman's language. What are resources?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. His liquid assets.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I see.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I do not think they go into the question as to whether the individual was on strike for the next few months or the next few weeks. It depends entirely on whether he meets the qualifications.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Has the committee considered whether this is, in effect, aiding a striking union in its bargaining with management?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. For this particular example, I believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Has the committee considered this fact?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I doubt very much whether the committee has gone into this. I had it brought to my attention and I was given to understand that, yes, if the people would qualify from their liquid assets and their income, they would be eligible to receive the benefits.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. May I have the Chairman's attention? May I ask the Chairman if the committee has considered the fact whether giving this aid to striking employees is, in effect, putting the Government in the position of assisting labor against management?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is clear that the committee did not consider it at this session of Congress, but it was considered 3 years ago when the original legislation was passed.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Did the committee consider that, in effect, the Government was assisting the union against management, but did not feel that was sufficient cause for failing to qualify?

Mr. POAGE. No, the committee did not make any finding on that matter. The committee did not take any position. Obviously, it did not feel we were giving aid.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Is it the Chairman's view that such aid and assistance is proper within the laws as written?

Mr. POAGE. I believe so, yes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say under the direct distribution program they could qualify also. They qualify, whether it be direct distribution or not.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri.

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] such time as he may consume.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the food stamp program, but in opposition to the proposed provision requiring 20-percent participation by the States in the purchase of bonus coupons.

The very real success of this program to date has, in large part, resulted from the careful study that has been given it by the Congress. The program as we know it today is the gradually expanded result of practical research which was accomplished through experience in the pilot areas. In none of the pilot areas—and in none of the operating areas—has the locality been requested to pay a share of the cost of the bonus coupons. They have shared in the cost of the administrative expenses.

The participants in the program—those individuals purchasing the stamps—have shared in the cost of the coupons. This is the manner in which the pilot programs were developed. It was this experience that formed the basis for the 1964 act. An attempt at that time to require State and local cost-sharing on the bonus coupons was soundly defeated. The participating localities came into this program in good faith, with no expectation that they would at some later date be asked to greatly increase their cost.

In the Cleveland area, there are about 63,000 men, women, and children receiving adequate food under this program, paying two-thirds of the cost of the stamps themselves and receiving an average of $6.61 worth of additional food purchasing power per month.

If the State were required to pay 20 percent of the value of the bonus coupons, that would be about $3,000,000 a year for the entire State, or half-a-million dollars just for Cuyahoga County.

The 20-percent provision will greatly impair the program and should be defeated.

I have received many letters in opposition to this proposal from my constituents. I have also received letters from State officials including the very able and distinguished Governor of Ohio, James A. Rhodes, which I include:

THE STATE OF OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
State House, Columbus, May 9, 1967.

Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FEIGHAN: I am writing to express my concern over HR 1318, the Food Stamp Authorization Bill of 1967. The measure was amended by the House Agriculture Committee to limit the food stamp program to a one year extension and to require participating states to contribute 20% of the bonus value of the stamps distributed.

Under the existing law, the food stamp program is funded entirely by the Federal Government. Requiring 20% state participation would result in severely curtailing, if not terminating the food stamp program in Ohio. Several million dollars would be involved.

More than 175,000 Ohioans in twenty-three of our state's twenty-four Congressional Districts presently participate in the program. The continuation of its benefits for these people is at stake. I urge you to oppose these amendments and support the continuation of the existing food stamp program should HR 1318 come to the House floor.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. RHODES,
Governor.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] such time as he may consume.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I endorse the original bill as introduced. I am for the bill but opposed to the amendments attached thereto.

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, we are faced with fundamental decisions respecting the food stamp program of 1964. If the Congress has not acted affirmatively by the end of this fiscal year, this excellent program ends. We have only about 6 weeks in which to resolve our differences and extend a program which on the whole has been very well received. More significant perhaps than its acceptance has been its success in improving the diets of nearly 2 million of our fellow citizens.

I presume to speak with some authority on this program. We eased into it deliberately and cautiously. We walked before we tried to run. Bills were introduced as early as 1954; we waited a whole decade to enact the 1964 legislation. Actually, we had pilot projects beginning in 1961. The act of 1964 authorized a program through June 30, 1967. Surely the results evident today strongly support its extension, and that without crippling amendments.

Walker County in my district was one of those pilot projects. There were others, older pilot projects in West Virginia and several other States. My Walker County came into the program on May 6, 1963. It is a voluntary program—we did not have to take it. But we did try it and we find it very helpful to a lot of people. As of January 1967 a total of 4,738 persons in Walker County were participating in the food stamp program. Of that total 2,022 persons were under public assistance and 2,716 were not under public assistance. The average stamp bonus per person in January 1967 was $7.27. In other words, if the entire grocery bill of these low-income people was covered by coupons issued, they were eating 49 percent better than would otherwise have been the case. Not only do they buy more to eat, but studies of other pilot counties indicate a significant increase in purchases of high-quality protein and protective foods.

H.R. 1381, as introduced by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], properly puts the program on the basis that it is not to be terminated unless and until the Congress does so. As amended by the committee, authorization for future appropriations would be limited to fiscal 1968. That is bad, almost if not quite unworkable. If accepted, that amendment would mean that next year and each year thereafter, if the program should survive such a strangling technique, the Congress would first have to pass a new food stamp authorization bill before the Committee on Appropriations could even consider a request for funds. I support H.R. 1318 as introduced in January. It would permit orderly programing and budgeting, not only by the Federal Government but by the States and local governments involved. Under the amendment proposed, all would be uncertain if not chaotic. This aspect, the need for a definite, continuing program able to include additional areas becomes doubly important in the months and years ahead as Government food distribution of "surpluses" will be increasingly restricted by reduced availabilities. We need not regret the decline in a program which handed out a few items on the basis of availabilities if we have the food stamp program with procurement of food in our regular marketing channels where stamp users have access to the same foods available to others in our society.

The other amendment proposed by the committee would have even worse results. Beginning July 1, 1969, each State would be made responsible for financing 20 percent of the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households in excess of the charges paid by such households.

This not only raises a serious question of whether the States and local communities can afford such additional charges, but also whether it is fair. The burden upon the non-Federal section is now very heavy. It has been estimated that such charges on the States of perhaps $40 million per year would force most of the States now participating out of the program and discourage others from entering. Thus many of our fellow Americans would be deprived of basic nutrition. Please keep in mind that the food stamp program is not a substitute for welfare payments. No State may reduce welfare benefits because of the operation of this program. The food stamp program will, if it continues, increasingly substitute for the inadequate rations supplied by Federal distribution of "surplus" foods, That burden, in equity should continue to be the responsibility of all the people.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] such time as he may consume.

(Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support the gentlelady from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], in her efforts to eliminate the requirement that the States pay 20 percent of the cost of the bonus food coupons.

In McDowell County, which is located in the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia, the Nation's first test of the food stamp program started on May 29, 1961. Therefore, West Virginia, and especially the Fifth Congressional District is fittingly a strong advocate and user of this method in helping low-income families obtain more adequate diets.

The food stamp recipients enthusiastically support the program which now operates in 40 West Virginia counties with over 93,000 participants. This essential program will soon be inaugurated in an additional eight counties in my home State.

Because of health benefits, which have been so evident, the food stamp program should be active in all 55 counties as soon as Federal funds are available, which when completed will benefit our Nation. The food stamp program is a significant stepping stone for low-income West Virginians in providing a minimum but adequate diet which is vital to their physical health.

Merchants, bankers, mayors and other city and town officials, welfare workers, and recipients are frequently quoted in large and small newspapers throughout the West Virginia food stamp areas, and their thoughts add up to a general agreement that the food stamp program:

First. Helps needy families to buy more and better food with dignity and freedom of choice.

Second. Increases business for retailers.

Third. Gives a boost to the entire economy of the area.

Fourth: Helps expand farm markets.

At present and anticipated levels of operation this fiscal year, the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates the total value of "bonus" food coupons—representing added food-buying power—flowing into the economy of West Virginia will exceed $7 million, compared with $4.3 million in fiscal 1966 when 18 counties had programs.

The State and localities are required to pay the administrative costs of the

program, including certification of eligible families and coupon issuance and accounting. Such costs typically run to about 7 percent of the value of the Federal "bonus"—thus West Virginia sources will be contributing close to $500,000 to the program in fiscal 1967.

Requiring an additional 20-percent contribution in the future might well mean cancellation of this program in West Virginia because of the financial inability of my home State to fund this additional share.

Such a provision is contained as an amendment to H.R. 1318, the bill to extend the Food Stamp Act, as it was reported by the House Agriculture Committee. In order to insure that the program continues to function in West Virginia and other States, this undesirable provision should be deleted by the House.

Mayor John Pat Flanning, of Iaeger, McDowell County, of my congressional district, says succinctly:

If the program were stopped it would kill the merchants.

No one has dared speculate on what it would do to nearly 100,000 low-income and needy residents of West Virginia.

West Virginia counties in the food stamp program as of April 1967 are: Fayette, McDowell, Mercer, Mingo, Monroe, Summers, and Wyoming Counties of my congressional district, as well as Barbour, Boone, Braxton, Cabell Calhoun, Clay, Doddridge, Gilmer, Greenbrier, Harrison, Jackson, Kanawha, Lewis, Lincoln, Logan, Marion, Mason, Monongalia, Nicholas, Pendleton, Pocahontas, Preston, Putnam, Raleigh, Randolph, Roane, Taylor, Tucker, Upshur, Wayne, Webster, Wirt, Wood.

Scheduled to inaugurate programs during May 1967 are these counties: Brooke, Hancock, Marshall, Ohio, Pleasants, Ritchie, Tyler, Wetzel.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be deleted by the House because this program is so essential to the health of our citizens who have been found eligible due to an insufficient income to provide an adequate diet. Especially does this program benefit the youth of today to develop physicially for the responsibilities that will be theirs tomorrow.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this program is an investment in the future of America.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], such time as he may consume.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the food stamp program has helped nearly 100,000 West Virginians, all of whom are grateful for the valiant fight made by the champion of this program, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

In my own congressional district, 24,000 persons are receiving $2 million in bonus coupons. These people would otherwise not be able to afford a minimum diet.

The State of West Virginia is one of the States which finances the entire cost of the food stamp program, with no assistance from the localities benefited. The committee has proposed the requirement that the States pay 20 percent of the cost of the program. Such a committee amendment, Mr. Chairman, would mean the end of the food stamp program in West Virginia, because it would require our State to pay $2 million a year. Of this cost, $500,000 would be in my own congressional district. The Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable Hulett C. Smith, has wired me that with this provision the food stamp program would have to be abandoned in West Virginia. I certainly hope that this amendment is rejected when it comes up on the floor.

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], 5 minutes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the committee bill as presented to us should be approved by the House. It is a reasonable approach in a continuation of the food stamp program which has been and is most successful. It has worked well.

The committee bill authorizes the extension of the food stamp program for 1 year and stipulates $195 million as a ceiling on Federal expenditure. The gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], who has done lauderable work in sponsoring this act from its inception, presented to us a bill which called for a permanent extension and left the amount of yearly Federal outlay in funds to be approved by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, that is by the Congress itself each year. The 1-year extension, with the specific ceiling and authorization, means closer scrutiny of all phases of the food stamp program and periodic congressional review.

The amendment adopted by the Committee on Agriculture providing for the participating States to pay 20 percent of the cost of the bonus or free stamps issued to its recipients after July 1, 1969, would mean more State involvement and more voice on the part of our States and local people. It would assure the continuation of a successful program with a minimum of abuse.

One dollar contributed by the States for every $5 of Federal funds is not an excessive expenditure. It is a reasonable amount for the States to share.

The effective date of July 1, 1969, would accord adequate time for all legislatures to meet the requirements of the amendment if they wished to do so.

This basic provision could come as a distinct shock to some, or perhaps many, States that have enjoyed the benefits of the food stamp program of the past 2 or 3 years.

I hope that the committee bill will be approved.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I just wonder if the gentleman knows that for his own district alone, under the 20-percent matching-fund provision, his State at the 1968 level of participation would have to pay an estimated $705,000 a year. Does the gentleman feel that his State would pay that portion?

Mr. GATHINGS. I say to the gentlewoman that 20 percent is a reasonable amount to call upon the States to pay. It would be a shock, no doubt, for our State and for many States to pay $1 for every $5, that they did not have to pay in the years 1966 or 1967. But we would have ample time to consider the matter between now and July 1, 1969. The real issue we faced in the Agriculture Committee was getting a bill out of the Committee. Without the 20 percent and other amendment our effort would have been emptyhanded and fruitless.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Would the gentleman be willing to require his State also to pay 20 percent of the cost of the rice program, 20 percent of the cost of the cotton program, and 20 percent of the cost of all the other farm subsidies that the Federal Government pays today?

Mr. GATHINGS. I say to the gentlewoman, that is not the issue with which we are confronted here today. The States do share the costs to a larger degree than this 20 percent in other welfare programs such as old age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the disabled.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman. Of course, I think this is very much a part of this issue.

Mr. GATHINGS. Farm prices in March 1967 were 10 percent below what they were in March 1947 while retail food prices over these years have advanced more than 33 percent.

I support the committee bill and hope that it will be approved.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment which provides that 20 percent of the food stamp plan, beginning July 1, 1969, will be financed by the States participating in the program. I have long felt this is a wise provision. I offered a similar amendment when I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture. I understand now that the amendment stems from the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. I should like to indicate my strong support for it.

A question was raised a little while ago by our colleague from Washington that if the committee operated in good faith it would also suggest a 20-percent State payment on direct distribution. However, the two programs are not comparable. In the direct distribution all of the foods available under the food stamp plan is not available to the poor recipient. For instance, if we consider the product of wheat, only flour is available under direct distribution, but under the food stamp plan eligible recipients are able to secure bread. The difference in cost between flour and bread is much greater than 20 percent. We can also think of other commodities not available, such as vegetable crops and so forth, which are available under the food stamp plan.

We should compare, as the committee did, as is shown in the minority views in the letter from the Library of Congress, the percentages of Federal share in a number of welfare programs, such

as old-age assistance, aid to families with dependent children, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and medical programs.

On page 31 of the committee report we see that the Federal share ranges from 67 percent down to 47 percent, for 1966, and in 1968 it is estimated to be from 65.6 percent down to a low of 53 percent.

So in all of these welfare programs it is found to be wise that the local community or the State share in the cost of the program. I think this is wise, too. If the food stamp plan is to be expanded so as to be a program that will cover the entire country, we should do this. I do not really feel it is a comparable request, I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], when he says it was not in good faith that the amendment was offered in this way.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUIE. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. FOLEY. Would the gentleman say that the food distribution program had some corollary to the State and municipal welfare programs?

Mr. QUIE. It is a corollary to the welfare programs available here.

Mr. FOLEY. Yet we made no requirement for any kind of share, 10, 20, 30, or 40 percent, in that program. Is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. No. As I listed here, in all of the welfare programs there is a sharing on the part of the State.

Mr. FOLEY. Except for the Federal distribution of the food.

Mr. QUIE. Direct distribution. Of course, the Federal Government already owns these commodities and therefore is making them available to the poor people of the communities. The Federal Government does not already own all of the commodities available under the food stamp plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. I ask the gentleman is it not a problem in some areas that welfare recipients have not utilized the grants completely, as was anticipated in the original legislation? Would the gentleman not concede that there have been some areas of public assistance where recipients have not been found to be spending the grant for what was anticipated to be the purpose, that is, for rent, food, and other staples?

Mr. QUIE. Like old age assistance, you mean, or aid to dependent children?

Mr. FOLEY. That has been a constant criticism of the program.

Mr. QUIE. That is right. Or some people are not qualified to receive it who did receive it.

Mr. FOLEY. But even those qualified have sometimes been criticized for not spending it in a proper way.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. Would not the gentleman feel it is desirable to encourage the families on public assistance to take a portion of those public assistance grants and spend it on food?

Mr. QUIE. Especially what people on public assistance should be encouraged to do is to make a wise expenditure of the money they receive, in other words, to use it wisely. This is the problem with all the people on old age assistance.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Would not the gentleman from Minnesota state, or believe, that the food stamp program is perhaps most comparable to the school lunch programs and is it not a fact that under that program there is local participation to the extent of approximately two-thirds, I believe? Is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. In the school lunch program there is a requirement for local participation.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. And it is surprising to me to note the objection of the principle of local participation in this program since it is comparable in purpose.

Mr. QUIE. I think it is, and it would be a wise strengthening of the program if we require 20 percent of local and State participation. We would have greater confidence on our part that it was wisely expended. This amendment surely has my support.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think as we come to the close of this discussion, it is rather evident that there are only a few very simple questions involved. I think the first one of those is, Are we really interested in getting a bill?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that there are many Members who are very naturally, and properly, interested in protecting their records. But if you are interested in getting a bill, it is my opinion that this debate has rather sharply emphasized the fact that the middle position will probably result in a bill. That is the position adopted in the committee, as represented by the two committee amendments to the proposed legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion at least that this debate has made it quite evident that it will be very questionable whether or not we get a bill, if a majority of the Members insist upon striking the amendments, as the original bill proposes.

For one, I want a bill. I support the food stamp program and I supported it in the beginning. Our committee supported it in its inception. I believe it has made a good record.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that it is well to continue the food stamp program. But I do not believe it is well to turn it loose without any inducement to the States to participate therein; without, an inducement for them to be prudent in their administration of the provisions of this bill, if adopted, or to be prudent in the number of people who are placed under the program.

Mr. Chairman, the committee amendments, if adopted, do enjoin such prudence on the part of the States. The other committee amendment does retain the legislative oversight which most Members of this Congress profess to want to retain in connection with legislation of this type. It does nothing more than to say that before we can authorize another appropriation that it shall be referred back to the House Committee on Agriculture and back to the entire House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion that does not seem to be an unreasonable situation. So I would urge that all those who are really deeply and seriously interested in maintaining a food stamp program, as contrasted with those who simply want to promote some philosophy or develop some viewpoints which, perhaps, would sound quite well but would put no food on the table, I believe the practical thing to do is to sustain the committee amendments and in that way I believe we have every reasonable prospect of obtaining a continuation of this program at a good, high level.

Mr. Chairman, I say this because this bill authorizes an appropriation at just as high level as the Bureau of the Budget requested. We did not cut one dollar from it. We are seeking to continue the program. We are seeking to expand it. We are not trying to destroy anyone. But we do want a workable program and a sound program. We want one in which there will be an inducement for honesty. We want one in which there will be a reward for proper administration rather than one which will reward the most extravagant administration of the program.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion that really is all that is involved in this discussion.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, would not the gentleman from Texas say that if this program is not worth 20 percent of the State's money to bring this type program into the State, then he does not think that the Congress should have passed it in the first place?

Mr. POAGE. I certainly would say that. This will represent the cheapest program that the States will be able to get. They are paying 50 percent of the cost of construction of every State highway. When one says that his State cannot pay 20 percent of the cost of this program, he is saying that his State is more interested in highways than it is interested in people. And if any State wants to say that, I believe that is up to the individual State and not up to this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believes that the people at home ought to have the right to make these decisions for themselves and in return should be required to expend some of their money in supporting their programs.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I just wonder if the gentleman from Texas has any testimony to show that there has been any ex-

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 25, 1967
For actions of May 24, 1967
90th-1st; No. 82

CONTENTS

Animal welfare.....13
Appropriations.....13,17
Buildings.....32
Community development....8
Conservation reserve....13
Consumer credit.....10
Dairy imports.....24
Education.....9,16
Electrification.....15
Farm labor.....2
Farm prices.....4
Farm program.....18
Firefighters.....25
Food stamps.....1
Foreign trade.....5,19
Great Plains.....13
Lands.....20,30
Legislative program.....17
Meat imports.....22
Mink imports.....21
Moving expenses.....23
Reclamation.....12,29
Recreation.....6
Research.....11,13
School lunch.....28
Selective service.....17
Small business.....26
Tariff.....27
Taxation.....14,17,23
Trade agreements.....19
Vocational education.....9
Water resources.....3,7
Watersheds.....31
Wool.....27

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported food stamp bill. House received supplemental appropriation bill conference report. House committee voted to report REA financing bill.

SENATE

1. FOOD STAMPS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 953, to extend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (S. Rept. 289). Debate on the bill is to begin May 31. ~~p. S7322~~

2. FARM LABOR. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendments S. 9, to authorize on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training, and certain flight training under title 38, U. S. Code, to increase the educational assistance allowances under such chapter (S. Rept. 290). p. S7322

3. WATER RESOURCES. Passed without amendment S. 1788, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments. pp. S7312-4

Sen. Burdick inserted two resolutions adopted by the N. D. Legislature endorsing the establishment by the President of the Missouri and the Red-Souris-Rainey River basins Commissions. pp. S7407-6

4. FARM PRICES. Sen. Jordan, Idaho, criticized the "spread in prices paid by the consumer and in the price received by the producers for their products," and urged Secretary Freeman "to make every effort to improve the situation." pp. S7391-2

5. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Yarborough commended the President for his actions "to begin a new, far-ranging study of the overall export situation." pp. S7365-6

6. RECREATION. Sen. Yarborough inserted an article which endorses his bill S. 4, to create the Big Thicket National Park, Tex. p. S7350

7. WATER. Sen. Muskie commended the President for the "Water for Peace" program designed to "encourage nations to put existing water technology to work in the interest of peace, growth, and progress." pp. S7372-3

8. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Clark inserted a "Summary of Resolutions Adopted at the Annual Conference and Meeting of the National Association for Community Development," many of which relate to the war-on-poverty and rural development. pp. S7399-7400

9. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION. Sen. Morse inserted an article urging a more progressive vocational education program. pp. S7409-13

10. CONSUMER CREDIT. Sen. Dirksen inserted a resolution passed by the Ill. Senate which "urges the Congress not to preempt the regulation of consumer credit and not to destroy our consumer credit laws." p. S7317

11. RESEARCH. Received from the Defense Department a report on grants for basic scientific research for 1966. p. S7321

12. RECLAMATION. Received a report from the Interior Department on determinations relating to construction payments due the U. S. from the Highland-Hanover and Upper Bluff Irrigation Districts, Missouri River Basin project, Wyo. p. S7321

HOUSE

13. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 9481, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1967 (H. Rept. 301). On the items in disagreement the conferees recommended (1) $25,000 for administration of the Animal Welfare Act with instructions that it be used for travel costs of departmental personnel and (2) $650,000 for the Conservation Reserve program (pp. H6124-6). For other items of interest to this Department see Digest No. 78.

Received from the President an amendment to the 1968 Budget requesting an increase of $2,300,000 in the request for the Great Plains Conservation program, making a total request of $16,336,000 for this program for 1968 (H. Doc. 128); to Appropriations Committee. p. H6126

Calendar No. 279

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 953

[Report No. 289]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 9 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 8), 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

MAY 24, 1967

Reported by Mr. ELLENDER, with an amendment

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, ~~That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year" and substituting therefor "and for each subsequent fiscal year such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."~~ *That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after*

"June 30, 1967;" the following: "not in excess of $200,-000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; not in excess of $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970;".

SEC. 2. Section 16(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose."

Calendar No. 279

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 953

[Report No. 289]

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia

FEBRUARY 9 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 8), 1967
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

MAY 24, 1967
Reported with an amendment

Calendar No. 279

90TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 289

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM EXTENSION

MAY 24, 1967.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 953]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 953), to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This bill, with the committee amendment, would authorize appropriations for the food stamp program for the fiscal years ending in 1968, 1969, and 1970. It would authorize up to $200 million for fiscal 1968, $225 million for fiscal 1969, and $250 million for fiscal 1970. The current authorization, which expires with fiscal 1967 authorized up to $75 million for fiscal 1965, $100 million for fiscal 1966, and $200 million for fiscal 1967. The appropriation for fiscal 1967 was $139.5 million. An appropriation of $195 million has been requested for fiscal 1968.

The committee amendment further provides that the act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for the specific purpose of carrying out the act. This is to make it clear that funds appropriated by section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, or any other act appropriating funds for any other purpose, are not to be transferred or otherwise made available for carrying out the Food Stamp Act. Section 32 funds are appropriated for the purpose of removing surplus stocks of agricultural commodities, primarily perishable agricultural commodities, from the market whenever that action may become necessary. Ordinarily the amount appro-

priated exceeds the amount used, but it is appropriated so that it will be available when needed. Transfer of these funds to other purposes tends to remove this insurance.

Hearings

The Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation conducted hearings on this bill on April 25. Except for the Farm Bureau, which asserted that it was opposed to any food stamp plan, all witnesses favored the bill. The hearings have been printed and are available.

Background Information

THE PROGRAM

The purpose of the food stamp program is to assist low-income households to increase their expenditures for food and to upgrade the quality of their diets. Under it, eligible households exchange the amount of money they have been spending for food for an allotment of food coupons of higher monetary value. (The difference between the amount the household pays for the coupons and the value of the coupon allotment—the free coupons—represents the Federal contribution to the household's increased food purchasing power.) The household then uses the coupons to purchase any food—except for certain imported items—in regular retail stores at the retail price prevailing in such stores. Retailers redeem the coupons through the commercial banking system.

The poorest families pay about $2 per person for about $10 worth of coupons per person. The average family in the program pays about 64 percent of the value of the coupons it receives.

Participation in the food stamp program is voluntary on the part of the States. In the meantime, the direct distribution of abundant foods will continue to be available to those communities not desiring to participate in the food stamp program or until such time as the stamp program can be extended to all communities which desire to participate.

PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY

Participation in the food stamp program is limited to those households whose income is determined to be a substantial limiting factor in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet.

A household is defined as a group of related or nonrelated individuals, who are not residents of an institution or boarding house, but are living as one economic unit sharing common cooking facilities and for whom food is customarily purchased in common.

In addition to households which can be classified as (welfare) "assistance" households, other low-income households—"nonassistance" households—are eligible. However, each State must establish standards of eligibility for nonassistance households which shall include maximum income limitations consistent with the income standards used by the State in the administration of its federally aided public assistance programs.

FEDERAL-STATE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

The State agency responsible for the administration of the federally aided public assistance programs, must accept responsibility for the intrastate administration of the food stamp program.

The following administrative responsibilities are assigned to States under the provisions of the act: (1) The certification of applicant households, including nonassistance households; (2) the acceptance, storage, and protection of coupons after their delivery to receiving points within the States; and (3) the issuance of such coupons to eligible households and the control and accounting therefor.

The State agency may, subject to State law, delegate statewide supervisory responsibility for the issuance of coupons to another agency of the State government. In either event, it will be possible for the State to make arrangements with local governmental agencies (or with banks) for the actual sale and issuance of the food coupons.

In addition to its responsibilities as the Federal supervisory agency, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has direct responsibility for the approval and supervision of cooperating retail stores.

CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES

The State agency must certify applicant households under the same general procedures and merit-system personnel standards used by it in the certification of applicants for benefits under the federally aided public assistance programs.

Federal funds are available to finance a limited share of the costs incurred by the State agency in the certification of nonassistance households.

If there is gross negligence or fraud on the part of the State agency in the certification of applicant households, the act provides that the State shall be liable for the value of any federally financed (free) coupons issued as a result of such negligence or fraud.

STATE PLAN OF OPERATION

The State agency of each State desiring to participate in the program must submit a plan of operation for approval by the Department of Agriculture.

Among other things, the plan of operation must specify the manner in which the program will be conducted within the State, the political subdivision in which the State desires to conduct the program, and the effective dates of participation by each such political subdivision.

THE APPLICATION PROCEDURE

The Food Stamp Act provides for the progressive expansion of the program, over a period of years, to those political subdivisions which desire to participate. It further provides that the Department of Agriculture shall give due consideration to the need for equitable treatment among the several States, in accordance with their relative need for the program. The Department is also directed to take into account the demonstrated ability of the several States to assume the administrative responsibilities which are assigned to them under the act.

HISTORY

A food stamp plan was operated by the Department of Agriculture between 1939 and 1943 under the authority of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress. In September 1959, a food stamp program was explicitly authorized by Public Law 86–341 for the period ending January 31, 1962. This authority was not exercised, but in 1961 a pilot food stamp program was undertaken pursuant to section 32 of Public Law 320.

When the Food Stamp Act of 1964 was passed in August 1964, about 351,000 persons were participating in 43 pilot areas in 22 States. In February 1967, about 1.5 million persons were participating in 645 areas in 41 States and the District of Columbia.

The 1964 act authorized appropriations not exceeding $75 million for fiscal 1965, $100 million for fiscal 1966, and $200 million for fiscal 1967. The authorizations, appropriations, and obligations for these years are compared in the following table.

Food stamp program authorizations, appropriations, and obligations, 1965–67

[In millions of dollars]

	Year—		
	1965	1966	1967
Authorized by law	75	100	200
Appropriated	60	100	139.5
Obligated	35.6	70.5	(120–125)

Departmental Views

The letter from the Department of Agriculture requesting this legislation is attached. As requested, the legislation would have been open-ended, providing permanently for the appropriation of such sums as might be necessary. The committee felt, however, that some limits should be prescribed, and the committee amendment therefore limits appropriations to $200 million, $225 million, and $250 million, respectively for the fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1967.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, Public Law 88–525.

This bill would amend section 16 of the Food Stamp Act. It would provide appropriation authority for fiscal years beyond 1967. No other change in the substantive legislative authorities for the food stamp program is deemed necessary at this time.

Public Law 88–525, approved by the President on August 31, 1964, contemplated the progressive expansion of the program—over the period of the next several years—to those States and political subdivisions that desired to participate. That act, however, provided

appropriation authorities only through the fiscal year 1967. It is necessary, therefore, that section 16 of the act be amended to provide appropriation authorities to implement that policy of orderly and progressive program expansion.

When the Food Stamp Act was approved, the program was then operating in 43 areas—in 22 States—in which the food stamp approach had been carefully tested during a 3-year "pilot" period. Since then, the pace of the authorized expansion has, in fact, not kept pace with requests from States for the program. Nonetheless, by the end of the 1967 fiscal year, the program will be operating in about 800 areas in 41 States and the District of Columbia.

In requesting appropriation authority beyond 1967, it is contemplated that the policy of orderly and progressive year-to-year expansion would be continued. Such a policy would continue to permit State welfare agencies and this Department to provide the administrative organization and program supervision that is needed to insure the effective and efficient use of Federal funds in support of program objectives.

Action to assure States that the program will be continued beyond June 30, 1967, should be taken at the earliest possible date. If the future of the program for the next fiscal year remains in doubt, States will hesitate to complete 1967 fiscal year expansion plans—much less undertake the longer range plans to build the administrative organization needed to adequately supervise already operating programs.

The actual level of the annual appropriation for each fiscal year beyond 1967 would be determined by the Congress under the annual appropriation process. Additionally, because the proposed bill is concerned only with the continuation of appropriation authorities, it would not affect program cost or employment requirements for the program.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

* * * * * * *

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 16. (a) To carry out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; not in excess of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and not in excess of $200,000,000 for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; *not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; not in excess of $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970;* and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year. Such portion of any such appropriation as may be required to pay for the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments shall be transferred to and made a part of the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. *This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose.*

* * * * * * *

○

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 1, 1967
For actions of May 31, 1967
90th-1st; No. 85

CONTENTS

Animal research.....22	Limestone imports.....29	Recreation.....24
Appropriations....8,22,32	Lobbying.....16	Research.....14,22
Consumers.....12	Mink imports.....23	Seed-to-market.....21
Dairy imports.....28	Moving expenses.....25	Taxation.....2,25
Education.....11,31	Natural resources.....26	Truth-in-lending.....5
Ethics.....17	Organization.....30	User charges.....15
Food stamps.....1	Patents.....10	Veterans.....7
Foreign aid.....21	Personnel.....6,27	Vocational education....11
Foreign trade.....19	Political committees....27	Water resources.....14
Information.....9	Pollution.....4	Watersheds.....18
Lands.....24,26	Poverty.....3,13	World food.....20

HIGHLIGHT: Senate passed food stamp bill.

SENATE

1. FOOD STAMPS. Passed as reported S. 953, to extend the food stamp program. The bill as passed would extend the authority to appropriate funds for the food stamp program for 3 additional years. It would authorize the appropriation of up to $200 million for fiscal 1968, $225 million for fiscal 1969, and $250 million for fiscal 1970. pp. S7541-4

2. TAXATION. Adopted the conference report on H. R. 6950, to restore investment tax credit and allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property. This action cleared the bill for the President. pp. S7545-6, S7548

3. POVERTY. Sens. Dodd and Proxmire spoke in favor of the President's war on poverty and inserted an article supporting their position. pp. S7534, S7537

4. POLLUTION. Sen. Randolph spoke in favor of S. 780, the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967. p. S7533

5. TRUTH-IN-LENDING. Sen. Proxmire inserted a letter and an article endorsing S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill. pp. S7519-21

6. PERSONNEL. Received from the House of Representatives of Hawaii a resolution urging the enactment of various legislative proposals affecting federal employees. pp. S7510-1

7. VETERANS. Received a message from the House with its amendments to S. 16, to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who have served in the military during the Vietnam era. pp. S7549-51

HOUSE

8. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 10345, the State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary appropriation bill (pp. H6401-21). Agreed to a motion by Rep. Harrison to insert the following: "excluding the Federal Bureau of Investigation money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond 95 per centum of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)." (pp. H6420-1).

9. INFORMATION. Both Houses received a message from the President transmitting the fourth annual report on Special International Exhibitions; to H. Foreign Affairs and S. Foreign Relations Committees. pp. H6400, S7509

10. PATENTS. Rep. Kupferman commended and inserted an article, "The Crisis in Patents." pp. H6435-6

11. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION. Rep. Curtis praised private industry's on-job training programs and inserted an article on the subject. pp. H6436-37

12. CONSUMERS. Rep. Rosenthal inserted an article reporting the establishment in Nassau County, N. Y., of a department of consumer affairs. pp. H6440-1

13. POVERTY. Rep. Barrett criticized efforts "to kill the OEO and distribute its programs among other Federal departments and agencies" and inserted an article on the subject. pp. H6443-4

14. WATER RESOURCES. Received from the Federal Council for Science and Technology a copy of the annual progress report of the committee on Water Resources Research. p. H6448

15. USER CHARGES. Received from Treasury a draft bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize the collection of user charges, to permit any charges for customs services to be collected on a fixed rate of charge basis; to Ways and Means Committee. p. H6448

and ongoing cold confrontation with the Soviet Union, which we still call the cold war.

There are, then, at least four definable wars in Asia. By the same reasoning, there are no less than five wars swirling about the Middle East.

Most obvious is the conflict between Israel and the Arab states, which headlines our present concern. But if we were to resolve this war even to Israel's hurt, the other four wars would remain to plague our peace-seeking efforts.

Always beneath the surface of the struggles in the Middle East is the hatred in many Arab circles for the modern world which is western civilization. This struggle is clothed in the pious garb of anti-colonialism, but it is basically a rejection of western democracy, an alien ideology. Israel is not the cause of the Arab rejection of the west; Israel *is* the west. And its very presence in its midst is regarded as an affront to Arab dignity. Her very existence is termed "aggression". But if Israel did not exist, the fury of primitive wrath would be levelled against other western installations . . . from "library" to embassy.

Never too far beneath the surface is a second struggle, that between Arab and Arab, a war which goes underground in a ratio inverse to the intensity of the other struggles. Were it not for the existence of Israel, this war would come out in the full force of its bitterness. Its victims already number the assassinated heads of more than one Arab state. Its present manifestations are between Egypt and Yemen and between Nasser's Egypt and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The prize is the domination of the Arab world. Nasser may have one eye focused upon Israel, but the other eye is upon the lush oil fields of Saudi Arabia which will be easier to tap from a military posture astride the soon-to-be-evacuated British outpost in Aden. Nasser's thrust in the Yemen is so intense that he has used poison gas. And the world is silent. Israel dampens the inter-Arab struggle and even links Arabs together in league. Israel is hardly the cause of that dissension, only its excuse for seeking more arms. With Israel eliminated, the house of Arab unity will dissolve in a bath of blood.

There is still a fourth war whose existence was largely responsible for the fiasco of Suez in 1956. It disrupted the tri-partate alliance of England, France, and the United States. It, too, wears a pious garb, for it speaks in terms of the national interest. In truth, it has little to do with the national interest, for it is concerned primarily with corporate profit. It pays few taxes; yet it demands much. Its prize is concession to exploit the oil wealth of the Middle East. A truce has been declared in this struggle by economic armistice, but it is too soon to know the extent to which it remains a factor in the formation of American foreign policy or British foreign policy. Britain has retreated in this struggle, having conceded to United States corporations, but France has not forgotten the lesson. Here again, Israel is the mask, the pawn, and the victim, but not the cause.

The fifth war is the most insidious. It is the war between east and west, the struggle between the United States and the world of Communism, in its abstraction, and the Soviet Union in its representation.

These five wars are interrelated. One influences the other. Yet they are separate, for even if you were to solve one, the others would demand separate treatment. Some of the struggles in the Middle East are intertwined with those of Southeast Asia. The common element of the precipitate is the confrontation of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is at this point that east and west have met in bloody confrontation.

There is more and more evidence that mobilization in the Middle East was triggered not in Cairo, but in Moscow. For not one single tank could move for long in Egypt's Sinai desert without the spare parts from Russia. Not one bomber could take off from Egyptian airfields without instructions, guidance, and maintenance provided by Russia. Therefore, logical deduction should lead us to conclude that Nasser has been unleashed not only to attack Israel, but to embarrass the United States. It's the Cuba syndrome, the Berlin blockade test.

America's justification for being in Vietnam is that it has given a commitment to the government of South Vietnam to defend her against her attackers. Russia, then, has shifted the arena in which the American commitment is being tested, as if to allow the world to judge whether America is committed to safeguarding beleaguered nations as a sacred principle or whether America is simply concerned with expanding empire and arenas of influence. Whether this is Russia's intention or not, this will certainly be the result of this week of testing.

What we have in the Middle East is the explosive emergence of a marginal struggle that now shifts to center stage as part of the struggle in Vietnam. What we have in the Middle East is a conflict of world powers compounded by the rivalry of Arab states, emulsified by private investment, in all of which Israel is either symptom, pawn, excuse, or mask.

Elimination of Israel, even if that could be accomplished, would not resolve any of the more basic rivalries. In this context, the familiar assertion that it is only the Arab-Israeli issue which prevents the western powers from inaugurating an era of peace and harmony in the Middle East, must take its place with other old myths which do not square with new reality.

Israel is the diversionary issue on which the Arabs have presently concentrated their fire and behind which they conduct their rivalry. By acting as the breakwater, Israel has unwittingly rendered service to the Arabs and the west.

Israel is the barometer of storms having their sources elsewhere. And just as the falling barometer warns of approaching storms, so the falling fortunes of a small democracy warns of the weakening of the democratic world.

Hawks and doves are in confusion and few show consistency in their postures. Those who are hawks in one war may be doves in another. But no one can remain uninvolved for long. Each of us must frame a judgment upon which he will base his actions.

In evaluating each struggle, we must put the test of key questions. In each separate struggle, we must ask: Who subverts his neighbor? Which side seeks to expand the arena of human dignity? Which nation turns to the ballot rather than the bullet? Which prefers tanks and rocket to economic development? Which nations clamor for war? The answers may be difficult to ascertain for the issues are complex but final judgment must be based on the answer to the key question, which nation has asked for negotiated settlement at the peace table? The answer to this question must determine the nature of our commitment and which commands our support.

Once again the handwriting is on the wall. We are being tested, weighed in the balance. We must not be found wanting.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1967;" the following: "not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; not in excess of $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970;".

SEC. 2. Section 16(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, because of the necessary absence from the city of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on account of a death in his family, he has requested me to handle the bill today, and I shall do so to the best of my ability.

I am not as familiar with this measure, which extends the Food Stamp Act, as is the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, the pending bill would extend the authority to appropriate funds for the food-stamp program for 3 additional years. It would authorize the appropriation of up to $200 million for fiscal 1968, $225 million for fiscal 1969, and $250 million for fiscal 1970.

We have now had considerable experience with food-stamp programs. During the years between 1939 and 1943 a program was operated under the authority of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, which provides for diverting surplus commodities from the normal channels of trade. This program was suspended during World War II when our surplus stocks were used up. After the war there were many proposals for reinstitution of the program, and in 1961 a pilot operation was undertaken, again under section 32. The Food Stamp Act of 1964 was adopted in August 1964, providing authority for appropriation of up to $75 million for fiscal 1965, $100 million for fiscal 1966, $200 million for fiscal 1967, and such sums as Congress might thereafter authorize for subsequent years. The pending bill, as requested by the Department of Agriculture and introduced, would have provided permanent authority for the appropriation of such sums as might be necessary. The committee felt, however, that even with

the experience accumulated to date, the program is still an expanding one, and some limits should be imposed to be sure that it is kept within bounds, while maintaining orderly growth. Appropriations for 1965, 1966, and 1967 have been, respectively, $60 million, $100 million, and $139.5 million. Provision of up to $200 million, $225 million, and $250 million for 1968, 1969, and 1970 should permit continued orderly development.

The program, which has been well received, provides low-income families with more adequate diets and expands our markets for farm products. It utilizes the existing channels of trade and commerce and existing welfare agencies to assure efficient and effective program administration. It is purely voluntary, operating under State-approved plans.

Whenever a State desires to participate in the program, the State agency which administers federally aided public assistance programs submits a plan of operation to the Secretary, specifying the political subdivisions to be covered, the effective dates, standards for approval of applicant households, and other details. When the plan is approved the State agency has responsibility for certification of the households eligible to participate in the program and for issuance of coupons.

Eligible households are restricted to those where income is a substantially limiting factor in the attainment of an adequate diet. After their eligibility is determined, they may purchase food coupons in the amount required to provide them with a more nearly adequate diet. They do not pay full face value for these coupons, but a lesser amount, equivalent to their normal expenditures for food. Thus, the purpose is to supplement, rather than substitute for, their normal expenditures, and to provide them with better, more healthful diets. The program does not free recipients' own funds for other purposes, nor does it transfer relief program responsibilities from the local governments to the Federal Government. Local governments are specifically prohibited from decreasing welfare grants because of program participation, and since the program requires participants to use their normal food expenditures for coupon purchase, it does not increase the feasibility of a reduction in welfare grants.

Coupons are redeemed for food by local merchants so that participants in the program are able to shop with convenience and dignity, obtaining those foods which they need and prefer. They are not restricted to a few commodities, such as cornmeal or other starches, but they may obtain some protein, vegetables, and other foods necessary to health and well being. Coupons may not be used for tobacco, alcoholic beverages, imported meats, other products identified as imported, or any nonfood items.

Local food stores, in turn, cash the coupons at their banks. Use of the regular channels of trade strengthens those channels, as well as giving the program the advantage of the efficiency and experience of the regular distribution system.

Thus, the program involves the joint efforts of the Federal, State, and local governments, local stores and banks, and the participants themselves. By providing a better diet for low-income families in a manner which requires them to maintain their own efforts, the program contributes substantially to the health and welfare of the Nation.

In addition to controlling the growth of the program through the continuation of ceilings on appropriations, the committee amendment limits the use of funds for the program to those specifically appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that purpose. The budget for fiscal 1968 proposes that the act be carried out with funds appropriated under section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress. The committee felt that the use for this purpose of funds appropriated for another purpose is not advisable. Funds are appropriated by section 32 to be available when necessary for carrying out that section. Its purpose is to protect markets for perishable agricultural commodities and to protect the producers of those commodities. Perishable commodities cannot be held by producers until the market improves. They must be marketed when ready for market, and if the market is glutted, the producer may face financial ruin. There is not time then to appropriate funds. They should be there, available to the Secretary when needed, for the diversion of surplus stocks from the market as they are brought to the market.

Mr. President, at this point I depart from the text which had been prepared for the use of my distinguished chairman, Senator ELLENDER, to say that, inasmuch as I come from a State where the great majority of our agricultural products are perishable, I am particularly interested in the safeguarding of section 32 funds. Those funds, derived from 30 percent of the tariff receipts of the Nation, are earmarked particularly to take care of surplus production in perishable crops that are nonprice supported—for instance, beef, pork, poultry, fruit, vegetables, and other highly perishable crops.

I have felt that the Budget Bureau has been exceedingly unwise in repeatedly trying to raid section 32 funds for use in this food-stamp program. This year, it has actually recommended raiding section 32 funds to the extent of $195 million for the carrying on in fiscal year 1968 of the food-stamp program.

So the committee unanimously has urged the Senate, in the committee amendment, which I hope will be adopted, to require that the food-stamp program be carried out only with funds appropriated for that specific purpose. This action is consistent with the provision of the basic legislation which characterizes the program as a welfare or social program to be carried out with welfare funds, rather than an agricultural program to be carried out with agricultural funds.

The food-stamp program is a growing program. Where $60 million was appropriated for 1965, $139.5 million was appropriated for 1967, and the committee amendment contemplates the appropriation of as much as $250 million for 1970. When the program is fully operative, it is contemplated that it will take about $425 million. Whether Congress ever agrees to its going to that figure is, of course, a question for Congress to determine. The section 32 fund is similar to an insurance fund. If we begin to use some of it first for this purpose and then for that purpose, we may well find that we do not have it when it is needed.

I have one more comment about section 32 funds. At this time, when we all know that the tariff revenues are due to be diminished by reason of the going into effect of the so-called Kennedy plan figures for reduction of tariffs, we are particularly anxious that no further encroachment upon section 32 funds be inadvisedly made.

Mr. President, I now move that the committee amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have nothing further to say upon this matter. As I have already announced, I am simply handling it in the absence of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who could not be here. I shall be glad to yield to any Senator who wishes to discuss this program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting floor manager of the bill what amounts, as provided in the measure, are recommended by the committee for each of the 3 years over which the program is being extended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Those amounts are $200 million for fiscal 1968, $225 million for fiscal 1969, and $250 million for 1970.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. May I ask whether or not the committee, during its deliberations on this measure, considered authorizations of higher figures than these which have just been stated by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from West Virginia, that this bill was handled in committee by the chairman of the committee, himself. The Senator may recall that the Senator from Louisiana was the father of the original food stamp bill. He himself suggested and insisted upon the figures which were placed in the bill, in the committee amendment which is now before the Senate—that is, the $200 million, $225 million, and $250 million figures for the 3 years covered by this program. He was quite insistent upon that, and I know that is his conviction.

The Senator from West Virginia will see, from the list of States affected by

this bill, that the State which the Senator from Florida represents in part is not affected at all. We have no food stamp program in our State.

But the Senator from Louisiana, by reason of his paternity of this bill, and for other reasons, has been very active in its furtherance; and I would not feel justified in departing from the figures which he insisted upon in the committee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I had had some indication from the Department of Agriculture that higher authorizations might be justified for fiscal years 1969 and 1970. Perhaps I should ask this question: How will the authorizations of $225 million and $250 million for fiscal years 1969 and 1970, respectively, compare with the amounts that have been appropriated for the program in the past 2 fiscal years?

Mr. HOLLAND. They are much greater than the amounts appropriated for the last 2 fiscal years. I shall give the last 3 fiscal years, since that covers the entire period of the operation of the bill: $60 million in 1965, $100 million in 1966, and $139.5 million in 1967.

I might add that in no year was the department able to commit and use the entire amount appropriated. For instance, in fiscal 1965, though $60 million was appropriated, the department used only $35.6 million. In 1966, though $100 million was appropriated, the department used only $70.5 million. We were told in committee that though $200 million was authorized and $139.5 million appropriated for 1967, it appeared that the total amount used this year would be somewhere between $120 million and $125 million.

So the amounts appropriated today are not only greatly under the amounts which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana requested be placed in the bill as limitations for 1968 and the 2 years to follow, but it also appears the department has never been able to use the amounts actually appropriated.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is saying that the amounts authorized in this bill for the 3 fiscal years of fiscal year 1968, fiscal year 1969, and fiscal year 1970, are in excess not only of the appropriations that were made in each of the past 3 years, but also in excess of the expenditures and in excess of authorizations for thosc years.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. For the present fiscal year 1967, $200 million was authorized, $139.5 million was appropriated and between $120 million and $125 million, we are told by the department, will be expended during this year. The making available in this authorization of $200 million for 1968, $225 million for 1969, and $250 million for 1970, in the opinion of the Senator from Louisiana, as stated to us with great conviction in the committee, was more than adequate, he thought, to cover the future growth of this program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Did the Department, during the hearings, attempt to justify any higher authorizations than are included in the bill before us?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Department attempted to justify appropriations without limit; in other words, an open-end authorization. I believe that the Department later talked to the Senator from Louisiana about some specific figures which were larger than these. But the Senator from Louisiana, who, as I say, has a very great interest in this program and naturally would, because he was the father of it, felt that these amounts were adequate and that they should be put in here to guarantee against growth that would be too quick a growth in the 3 years covered by the bill.

I will say to my distinguished friend that if we should find a need for greater appropriations we always have the possibility of amendment of the authorization bill, and if the Department has some new development not communicated to us, this bill has to go to the House of Representatives. I hope that the author of this bill, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], will accept the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana as to the soundness of this program and allow the bill, as included in the committee recommendations which have already been adopted, to be passed by the Senate today.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I understand that it is the judgment of the Senator from Florida, and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee, and the judgment of the committee that the authorizations provided in the bill before us will be ample to permit an efficient and judicious expansion of the food stamp program into areas not now participating in the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. That was certainly the statement and conviction of the Senator from Louisiana. I joined him in it. The committee unanimously approved it in the bill which is now recommended by the committee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, As the sponsor of S. 953, the bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for operations of the program for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending this June 30, I have been greatly encouraged by the well-nigh unanimous support of the extension of the Food Stamp Act beyond June 30. In reading records of testimony during hearings here in the Senate, and in the House on legislation of a similar nature, I have been impressed by the wide expression of views that the food stamp program is a vital, well administered, and effectively designed Federal program.

I had previously made my own observations as to its effectiveness of operations in my own State of West Virginia, having been closely associated with its development from the inception of the pilot program in McDowell County in 1961 to its present coverage of 48 out of West Virginia's 55 counties.

From my personal observations of the program operations in my State, and from reports on its operations in other areas of the United States, I wish to concur with the estimate expressed by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman—the food-stamp program is a success.

The program has more than lived up to the expectations under which it was undertaken. It has provided a new channel for the wise and provident use of this country's great abundance of foods to improve the diets and health of our low-income families. It has not only expanded food markets for our farmers, contributing to an increase in farm income, but it has also stimulated local economies in the areas in which the program is operating.

As a special merit of the system used by the food-stamp program—through the issuance of bonus coupons—this program has not degenerated into a system of handouts. It requires participating families to use some of their own income to purchase food. It has served to provide those who most need improved diets with an opportunity to purchase more and better food for less money. And the program has proved the wisdom of its design, in that it has been singularly free of corruption at the varied levels of its administration, according to reports available in the Department of Agriculture.

I feel that action to provide the continuation of this program and to insure an increasing availability of funds for effective expansion over the next 3 fiscal years is well considered and timely.

With regard to the views of some people that there should be matching funds required of the participating States for bonus coupons, I am convinced that this suggestion, as a minimal disadvantage, would cause a totally needless complication in what has heretofore been a smooth operating program.

I had looked into this matter prior to introducing S. 953. And I had discussed it with responsible officials within West Virginia. I concluded that such a matching requirement—which would be in addition to the costs the States now bear—would put the program out of reach of many States.

I want to go on record as approving the committee's action in deferring any consideration of State matching requirements under the food stamp program.

It believe it is important to recognize the basic concept of the food stamp approach. We are putting a national resource to work to assist the States to improve food consumption levels among the needy. This national resource is our abundance of food. It is the Federal Government that has this national resource at its disposal—not the States.

The free food coupons that the recipients receive are but a means to put that food abundance within the reach of our low-income families. These coupons represent the added food purchasing power that moves our food surpluses into consumption rather than into Government ownership under price support and surplus removal programs.

Thus, if we were to require States to match part of the cost of the bonus coupons, we would be taxing non-existent resources within the States—for our abundance of food is a national—not a State resource.

It is also important to remember that the States now share the cost of administering the program. The cost of carefully qualifying applicant families is a considerable one—but a necessary one to insure against waste and abuse. And

the States finance the costs of safeguarding and issuing the coupons.

These State costs represent about 7 percent of the value of the Federal subsidy. So, the States are sharing in the costs.

Finally, I believe the record of the hearings clearly indicates that a State matching of the bonus coupons may likely kill the program. I know that it would pose an additional burden in West Virginia, and other Senators have testified that it would seriously threaten the program in their own States.

Many States are now hard pressed to finance basic welfare programs and the Congress is constantly called upon to consider legislation to raise the amounts provided for such programs. In the face of these facts, some States may likely, however reluctantly, decide to switch back to the surplus donation program because that program requires no State matching of the value of the surplus foods made available by the Department of Agriculture.

If we kill the food stamp program, now, with a State matching requirement, we are forcing a return to the less effective and less sufficient surplus donation program. We are forcing States and low-income people to give up a more dignified, self-help program for the poor—one that has won wide acceptance, approval, and support; the use of a program that operates through commercial channels rather than in competition with them; the economic stimulus the bonus coupons provide to the local economies of hundreds of communities throughout the country.

It is important to note that the administration has recommended that the Congress permanently extend the food stamp program.

As with any ongoing program, it is necessary for the agencies involved to plan ahead. The present provision for appropriations for the next 3 fiscal years would provide the assurance of orderly progression. It will protect and maintain the administrative organization necessary for effective action.

I urge that the Senate pass the bill before it now—S. 953—the extension of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, and I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for having patiently answered the questions I have propounded. I also express gratitude to Senator ELLENDER and the Committee on Agriculture, and to Senator JORDAN, of North Carolina, and his subcommittee, for the prompt and effective action in reporting this bill for Senate consideration in ample time to avoid a lapse of funding authority.

Mr. HOLLAND. The committee felt that the subject matter was sufficiently important to require the early action we took.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, first, let me compliment the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the work they have done in reporting S. 953, and on its predecessor, the Food Stamp Act of 1964. The present legislation represents the continuation of a giant step forward in raising the dietary standards among the poor in the Nation.

Food stamps have now proved themselves in 3 years of national use—during which, I might add, the results have been carefully studied and open to public scrutiny.

The facts are in. They demonstrate that this is an effective program and that it can be operated at an acceptable level of Federal expenditure.

States and localities must request participation. Costs to the States and localities are such that no new areas will come into the program unless there exists a clear need. Expansion to date has been gradual and orderly.

No county is permitted to operate the food stamp program simultaneously with the commodity distribution program. So, when an area shifts to the food stamp program, there is an offset in some of the Federal costs.

I am especially pleased to see that the committee provided for another 3-year extension. This will give the States and localities time for proper planning. At the same time, Congress will be in a position to review progress and determine if the additional 3 years of experience will then require any legislative modifications.

In summary, then, the program is attaining its objectives; it has enjoyed good administration; the expansion has been well planned and orderly. The passage of this bill will further that expansion to new areas of need. I favor passage to accomplish that purpose, and I urge all Senators to do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

So the bill (S. 953) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is deeply indebted to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], for so graciously agreeing to handle this measure, which extends the food stamp program over the next 3 fiscal years. In managing this bill, Senator HOLLAND stepped in for the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, whose absense today was occasioned regrettably by a death in his family. Though called upon at the last moment to handle this vitually important measure, Senator HOLLAND performed the task in the truly outstanding manner that has characterized his many years of public service to the Nation. His articulate explanation of the bill assured its overwhelming approval by the Senate. We are most grateful.

We are grateful also for the contribution of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. His penetrating analysis is a welcome addition to the discussion of any measure.

Finally, the Senate may be proud of another achievement, obtained with dispatch and with full consideration for the views of every Member.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

At 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m. the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. MANSFIELD].

AMENDMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT OF 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, President Johnson on May 25 submitted a highly important message for improving and strengthening our political process. I am very much pleased with the message. It is not only sound, thoughtful, and comprehensive, but will be significant, I am sure, in the ultimate resolution of the difficult and vexing problems in this area.

The President speaks not only as the Chief Executive, but also from a wellspring of knowledge acquired as a seasoned and experienced political campaigner, and from 30 years of distinguished public service as a Representative, Senator, majority leader of the Senate, Vice President, and President.

After the searching and sometimes spirited debate which was recently conducted in this Chamber, I think it can be fairly stated that all agree that the time for action is at hand. The President's thoughtful proposals will guide our way to the achievement of our common purpose.

Briefly, here is the substance of the President's message:

First, he makes basic and fundamental proposals to revise and give new life and meaning to the laws regulating the conduct of Federal election campaigns. These proposals would place meaningful limitations on the total amount of political contributions which any individual could make, and would put teeth into the rules relating to the disclosure of contributions received and expenditures made by Federal candidates and political committees supporting such candidates.

In substance and principle, the need for these reforms is uniformly recognized. The President has given the cause of honest elections new vigor and leadership. I am confident that this Congress

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 9, 1967
For actions of June 8, 1967
90th-1st; No. 90

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments...27,34
Adjournment.....12,16
Appropriations.....1,11
Budget.....39
Census.....19
Dairy imports.....25
Electrification.....10,22
Employment.....33
Extension services.....32
Farm program.....3,17
Flag.....11
Food stamps.....2
Forest Service.....1
Holiday.....30
Honey imports.....31
Housing.....20,21
Information.....13,38
Lands.....21
Legislative program.....11
Livestock.....29
Manpower.....36
Mink imports.....26
Natural resources....15,21
Personnel.....8,35
Plant materials centers.....6,15
Poverty.....9,33
Program evaluation.....23
Property.....6
Public debt.....24
Reclamation.....10
Recreation.....15,18
Resources development 15,21
Salt-water research.....5
Selective service.....4,11
Tariff.....25,26,31
Tobacco.....27
Trade.....37
Transportation.....28
Truth-in-lending.....14
Water resources.....7
Wheat.....34

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to conference report on Interior appropriation bill, including FS. House passed food stamp bill. Rep. Michel criticized Secretary Freeman's statement on farm program to ASC personnel. Rep. Staggers introduced and discussed administration bill to provide reliability and efficiency of electric power systems. Rep. Zwach introduced and discussed bill to establish extension service in D. C. Rep. Skubitz introduced and discussed bill to permit adjustment of certain wheat allotments.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9029, the Interior and related agencies (including Forest Service) appropriation bill (pp. H6880-4). Concurred in the Senate amendment, which had been reported in technical disagreement by the conferees, to transfer $400,000 from "Timber development organization loans and technical assistance" to "Forest research" (p. H6884).

2. FOOD STAMPS. Passed, 230-128, with amendments S. 953 (in lieu of H. R. 1318), to continue the food stamp program (pp. H6889-916, H6918-19, H6969). Rejected,

90-143, an amendment by Rep. St. Germain to authorize $275 million for 1969, $350 million for 1970, and such amounts as may be determined for subsequent years (pp. H6890-5). Agreed, 148-91, to the committee amendment limiting the authorization to 1 year (pp. H6889-95). Rejected, by a record vote of 173-191, a committee amendment to require the States to pay 20% of the cost of the program, after first having agreed to the amendment by a teller vote of 141-120 (pp. H6895-906, H6914-5). Rejected an amendment by Rep. Ryan to prohibit exclusion of very low income persons (pp. H6906-9).

3. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Michel criticized Secretary Freeman's statement on the farm program at a meeting of ASC personnel. p. H6957

4. SELECTIVE SERVICE. Received the conference report on S. 1432, to extend and amend the Universal Military Training Act (H. Rept. 346). pp. H6884-9

5. SALT-WATER RESEARCH. Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. R. 6133, to authorize various additional appropriations for the salt-water conversion program of research and demonstration. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. H6875-7

6. PROPERTY. A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 472, to authorize the Department to purchase a land tract at Texas Southmost College, and H. R. 547, to provide for establishment of the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center at a more suitable location. p. D475

7. WATER RESOURCES. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved for full committee action S. 20 (amended), to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs. p. D475

8. PERSONNEL. Received from the Civil Service Commission a proposed bill "to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code"; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. H6977

9. POVERTY. Rep. Patten inserted a letter commending the Job Corps. p. H6973

10. ELECTRIFICATION; RECLAMATION. Rep. Hosmer commended the American Public Power Association's recommendations regarding the pending Colorado Basin Project legislation. pp. H6930-3

11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced the legislative program for next week: Mon., silver certificates bill; Tues., defense appropriation bill; Wed., schooling for armed forces' dependents; Thurs., flag desecration bill; and at some time during the week, the conference report on the selective service bill. p. H6916

12. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 12. p. H6977

SENATE

13. INFORMATION. Began consideration of S. 1030, authorizing establishment of an informational media guaranty fund. p. S7928

including such specific kinds of information as may be requested by the Congress.

There was no similar provision in the Senate language.

The Senate conferees had no objection to this provision in the House bill but recommended that the language of this section be modified to require a semiannual report in lieu of a quarterly report.

The House conferees concurred in the proposed changes and therefore the Senate recedes from its position with an amendment.

DIFFERENCE NO. 13

The House language—

(a) Gives precedence to selective service cases on the dockets of Federal courts and provides that such cases shall be given an immediate hearing. Appeals of such decisions also are given precedence; and

(b) Also provides that the Department of Justice must prosecute violations of the act upon the request of the Director of Selective Service or furnish a report in writing to the Senate and the House explaining its failure to do so.

The Senate language contains no similar provision.

The Senate conferees agreed to the objectives of the House language and therefore receded from their position and accepted the House language.

DIFFERENCE NO. 14

The Senate language would make permanent existing temporary authority provided the President to order reservists to active duty if they fail to properly discharge their reserve training obligation.

There was no similar provision in the House language.

The House receded from its position and accepts the Senate language.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
MELVIN PRICE,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
L. C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1318) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 1318, with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Monday, May 15, 1967, the Clerk had read the first section of the bill and the committee amendments thereto. Without objection, therefore, the Clerk will again report the committee amendment to the first section.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out lines 5 through 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the word 'and' the first time it appears therein and by inserting after the word "1967;" the words 'not in excess of $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968;'."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I rise in opposition to the first committee amendment which would limit to the 1968 fiscal year only the authorization for the appropriation of funds to continue the food stamp program. As I said Monday during general debate, I do not challenge or dispute the right of the Committee on Agriculture to review annually, or even more often if it so chooses, the operations of any program it authorizes. It has that right under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It can propose at any time amendments to, or limitations on, this program.

The food stamp law is permanent legislation. It was enacted in 1964 with no time limit on its operations. The only time limit was in the form of specified ceilings on appropriations for the first 3 fiscal years. So we have known since 1964 that a law would have to be passed before June 30, 1967, to permit the appropriation of funds to continue the program beyond that date. The committee could have amended the law in 1965 and 1966, but it did not bother.

I introduced a continuation bill last summer. It was not acted on. I introduced it again this year. Now it is before us. The deadline is on top of us. We are under the gun to get a law through right away. I am sure it will pass in time—I certainly hope so—but, under the committee amendment we would then have to go through this very same procedure next year and presumably every year thereafter—and always, I am afraid, the fight would be exactly on the same issue as it was in 1964 and as it is this year. The committee is not very enthusiastic about this program, as shown by both the majority and minority reports. It regards it primarily as some sort of welfare program rather than as a food utilization program.

Whenever the Committee on Agriculture takes up the food stamp bill, it seems to devote very little deliberation to the value of the program in expanding food sales and increasing domestic utilization of food, and instead argues over welfare policies. That committee does not have jurisdiction over welfare legislation. I have been urged for years to redraft the food stamp legislation to place the program in the Department of Welfare, and I resisted that because I believe the people in the Department of Agriculture know far more about food utilization than the people in the Department of Welfare. But if we keep running into this constant sniping at this program by the Committee on Agriculture as being some sort of terrible welfare program, then perhaps we should take this program, and the school lunch program, and the school milk program, and the feeding of the needy through direct distribution, and turn them all over to Ways and Means or Education and Labor for administration by HEW.

The Committee on Agriculture asks to have the right to rule on this program again next year, before permitting any of the existing food stamp projects to continue. But if you look through the hearings, you won't find a single word of testimony by any witness who indicated this program was not operating honestly, and as Congress intended. Of course, some of the members of the committee who are against the food stamp program grumbled a bit about rumors of abuses, but no evidence was presented that I know of to show any abuses.

What the committee wants to do is to cut back the program's cost by making the States pay more and the Federal Government less. This is the nub of the issue. The committee tried that in 1964 with a 50-percent sharing amendment, and we licked it. It is trying again this year with a 20-percent sharing amendment, and I hope we beat that, too. If we do not defeat this pending amendment for a 1-year limitation the committee undoubtedly will try once again next year to add further limitations and restrictions which could only have the result of damaging the effectiveness of the program, for any support voiced by the committee, for the program is at best lukewarm.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of agricultural programs which could stand annual review by the Congress a lot more than this one requires it. Section 32—which sets up a special reserve of hundreds of millions of dollars in customs receipts to be used exclusively to help the farmer—has not been the subject of a bill before Congress in 13 years, to the best of my recollection. It was enacted in 1935 as a depression measure. Should we keep it? Have the farmers some divine right to nearly $1 billion to be set aside next year just for removal of agricultural surpluses?

The wheat-cotton bill which we passed in 1964 as the price for getting the food stamp bill that same year does not require annual review by the Committee on Agriculture. But I think it is safe to say that if the committee amendment for mandatory annual reauthorization of the food stamp program carries, a lot of Democrats who have in the past voted for farm programs recommended by the Committee on Agriculture, are going to insist, first of all, that each such program have only a 1-year life, and then, perhaps like many of those on the Committee on Agriculture who voted against the food stamp program even after loading it down with crippling amendments, the urban Democrats may still not be satisfied.

I stress the word "Democrats" because in this bill today, the Democrats on the Committee on Agriculture who helped to amend this bill have been running interference for the other side of the aisle, which would like nothing better than to have the Democrats help the Republicans to kill one of the most successful of all of the antipoverty programs.

If you do not believe that, Mr. Chairman, take a look at the vote in the Committee on Agriculture. Three years ago, every Republican voted against food stamps. This year, the overwhelming majority of them voted against the program. Yet, they all believe wholeheart-

edly in these committee amendments. Who is kidding whom?

The opposition must be strictly political because this program is just as successful in the Republican districts as it is in Democratic districts. Perhaps the Republicans are against it because it is a Democratic program which works so well. I urge you to vote against this amendmcnt to limit the authorization to 1 year.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk to the committee amendment, and I wonder if it is proper to offer it now?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may offer his amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ST GERMAIN

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ST GERMAIN to the committee amendment: On Page 2, line 2, add the following after "1968;": "not in excess of $275,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; not in excess of $350,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1970; and not in excess of such funds as may thereafter be authorized by the Congress for any subsequent fiscal year."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ST GERMAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems incredible that in these affluent United States we should allow some of our citizens to be faced with starvation and yct it does occur in some counties across our land.

And though the surplus commodity and food stamp programs were introduced to overcome this, we have, for the most part, failed to arrest the problem in accordance with our capabilities. While the former program involves local storage and distribution costs, the latter entails recertification and administrative costs. But regardless of the cost of operating these programs in an efficient and effectual manner, they are necessary for those people who need our help most and, therefore, should be continued.

Though the merits of both of these programs are worthy of much note, Mr. Chairman, today I would like to dwell upon thc food stamp program.

There are many things that one in need can do without for awhile but food is not one of them. Therefore, when we consider the needs of the poor, food should be the primary consideration before all else.

The fool stamp program is an attempt to meet the primary need of the poor. If it is to realize the success that it should, meeting the basic need of our poor, it must be given sufficient time and support. We should authorize adequate appropriations for a long enough period so that the States may plan and implement their programs in accordance with the overall needs across the Nation. This will allow the States sufficient time to generate a program that will embrace all the needy within its borders.

In scanning the Nation, we noted that in Mobile County, Ala., there are 99,000 poor, yet no one has access to food stamps. In close by Virginia I am told that only 1.9 percent of the poor have access to their commodities or food stamps, and in Pulaski County, Ark., only 3,483 of its 67,000 poor participate in a food distribution program.

It is quite possible that while thousands of tons of food are shipped overseas, a majority of our Nation's poor go without necessary food.

What is needed, Mr. Chairman, is a firm commitment by the Federal Government to provide assistance to the States in building a strong food stamp program to meet the needs of the Nation's poor, not only today and not only for next year but for the next decade at least.

We must assure the States that adequate funds will be made available in the future to support their efforts to provide the poor with food.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 127]

Aspinall	Frelinghuysen	Pickle
Ayres	Gettys	Pike
Battin	Giaimo	Pool
Bell	Goodell	Reid, N.Y.
Blackburn	Gude	Ruppe
Bolling	Hanna	St. Onge
Brademas	Hansen, Idaho	Smith, Calif.
Bray	Hawkins	Smith, Iowa
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Springer
Burton, Utah	Hébert	Stratton
Clark	Holifield	Teague, Tex.
Corman	Horton	Thompson, N.J.
Dawson	Ichord	Ullman
Dent	Irwin	Vander Jagt
Dow	Kluczynski	Williams, Miss.
Fascell	Kornegay	Willis
Felghan	Long, La.	Younger
Fino	McClory	
Flood	McEwen	
Flynt	Mize	
Ford, William D.	Nelsen	
	O'Konski	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 1318, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 376 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

Thc Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would initially like to express my thanks to the minority for placing emphasis on the importance of this amendment.

For those Members who may not have been present when the amendment was read, the amendment extends the authorization under the legislation beyond the 1-year period in the committee amendment to 1969 in the amount of $275 million, and to 1970 in the amount of $350 million.

My colleagues, if we are going to take care of the undernourished, the underfed, and the starving of this Nation, we must allow our States to plan ahead of time. It is impossiblė, Mr. Chairman, for our States to plan ahead under a 1-year authorization.

The committee might state that they have not held hearings on the amounts covered in my amendment. By the same token I would say to the committee they had ample time to hold hearings, and that these amounts are what we feel are accurate projections of the needs in view of applications already approved, and not funded, and in view of applications that will be submitted.

The point of fact, as stated earlier, is the cities of Boston and New York arc waiting implementation of their programs because of a lack of funds.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If I understand correctly, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island has offered an amendment to the committee amendment which would authorize appropriations for this program for 3 more years rather than just 2.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. That is correct.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. And it is not an open-end authorization for appropriations?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. It would limit the authorization.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. At the end of the amendment it says, after June 30, 1970, "not in excess of such funds as may thereafter be authorized by the Congress for any subsequent fiscal year."

Mr. ST GERMAIN. For any fiscal year subsequent to 1970, that is correct.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. So it is not open ended. I want to say that 3 years' time is sufficient to meet my objections to the committee amendment. I just felt we could not accept a 1-year authorization because it would destroy all planning of the programs for future expansion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. BARRETT, Mr. ST GERMAIN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I have a list here of some 232 counties which have requested the food stamp program in their areas. They have been approved, but they have not been able to initiate thc program.

I have another list of 140 counties throughout the States which have requested the food stamp program, but which have not yet been approved for participation. It takes time to put these programs into being. You cannot plan ahead with just a 1-year authorization.

But if the committee would accept a 3-year authorization, as the gentleman proposes, I believe we could live with it and have a good program.

Both of the lists I have referred to were printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 14, 1967, at pages A1278 to A1287.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to join with the gentleman from Rhode Island in support of his amendment. I know from experience in many of the programs that we are confronted with, programs in the educational field and in other types of programs, that some long-range plans are absolutely essential. I believe it would be wholly unworkable to restrict this to a 1-year authorization.

I want to thank the gentleman for presenting his amendment, and I will support it.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that a great many of us have received similar communications to that which I received from my director of social welfare in the State of Rhode Island.

I would like to quote very briefly from that communication:

As we noted earlier the State of Rhode Island firmly committed itself to the Food Stamp Act of 1964. This commitment led to a large expenditure of time, effort and money to establish a Food Stamp Program in the State of which we could be proud.

As I stated, I am sure that many of you here on the floor today have had a similar experience in your own State.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RESNICK. I would like to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island on his amendment. I think it is a very worthwhile amendment and a very necessary amendment.

As a member of the committee, I would like to point out that the only way the bill could get out of the committee in the first place was with this crippling amendment which you have put an amendment onto. The people who proposed the amendment then voted against the bill in the committee.

In other words, your substitute will alleviate that problem.

As I say, this is a very good substitute and I think everybody should understand that if it does not carry and the original committee amendment carries, it will virtually wreck the food stamp bill.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. I want to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment.

I, too, believe that this should be at least a 3-year program instead of the 1-year period as provided by the committee amendment. This has been a very important program in our area of the country and the welfare officials are bipartisan in nature and we support this program very strongly. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. When I read from the communication from my director of social welfare in Rhode Island, I am sure the gentlemen on the minority side of the aisle are aware of the unfortunate situation in the State of Rhode Island where the State administration is led by a Republican Governor and as a result those in charge of our agency are Republicans and the head of this agency is a Republican but this particular administrator of social welfare happens to be one of the more effective administrators in the Nation so far as I am concerned.

I cited to you the plan that had been implemented in the State of Rhode Island for its effectiveness and its desirability.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on offering his amendment. I certainly urge its adoption.

[Mr. VANIK addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would want to call to the attention of the Committee the fact that there is much to be said in favor of some kind of assurance as to the length of a program. Your committee recognized that fact. But here on the floor we are faced with a practical problem just as we were in the committee. We originally had a bill introduced which was a completely open-ended proposition with no limitation upon the amount that would be spent other than that which would from year to year be written in by the Committee on Appropriations.

I do not think the substitute amendment changes that situation very much. It is true that it puts some figures in, but in fiscal year 1969 it will be $50 million more than the other body has already provided and the year after that it would be $100 million more than that body has already provided.

I do not think this House expects that we are going to appropriate funds of that magnitude.

Just yesterday the majority of this House said that they did not want to increase the debt limit. Well, you can vote on the debt limit—the debt is what is really vital and the way you limit the debt is by limiting what you spend. If you are going to spend $100 million a year more than the other body has provided, then I doubt that any limit is going to amount to much.

What we are talking about here is spending money. Your Committee on Agriculture was not hostile to this food stamp program. I was disappointed and chagrined when the gentlewoman from Missouri got up and castigated this committee as being hostile to the food stamp program. This is the committee that brought the food stamp program before this House. This is the committee that sponsored and passed the food stamp program. This is the committee that brought it to the floor this year.

I have said publicity that I was going to vote for a continuation of this food stamp program, whether you adopt the committee amendments or whether you do not. I think it is a good program and I think it is something which we should continue. I think that it will be a better program if we adopt the committee amendments. It is something that we will continue, but I think it is something that we should have a chance to review from year to year in the open.

If this committee amendment is not adopted, you will get a chance to review this program only before the Appropriations Committee, but how many of you can go down there and be heard? How many of you can hear what testimony is given before that committee? How many of us can read the testimony before the appropriation bill is before us?

The Committee on Agriculture does not function that way. Any Member of the House can come over there and be heard before our committee. All of you who wanted to be heard were heard this year. There was not a one of you who asked to be heard who was not heard. You have a chance to be heard before the legislative committee. You have a chance to present your attitude.

If you leave the review with the Committee on Agriculture, as this committee amendment provides, you will have an opportunity to be heard next year. If you kill the committee amendment, you will have no chance to be heard. You will have no chance to make any determination or to present any reason as to what should be done in the way of improving or changing the program or fixing the amount that is to be spent.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I appreciate the remarks of the Chairman. I am convinced of his sincerity. But by the same token, it is one thing to approve the United Givers Appeal or the United Fund Appeal, but it is another thing to make an actual contribution. As I stated previously, Mr. Chairman, I feel from the evidence that we have, individuals who have heard from our own constituents and others, in order for the States to implement these programs and keep them going, they have to have an authorization of more than 1 year.

There was some thought of an open-end authorization, an amendment for an open-end. This was changed to keep the authority with the Committee on

Agriculture. This would merely give them 3 years to know that they can work on this program and look forward to its implementation for these 3 years. They are already spending a goodly amount of money on the administration of these programs.

Mr. POAGE. I do not want to discuss the second amendment right now. The gentleman has, I believe, been attempting to discuss the second amendment. But the first amendment relates to the review procedure, and the effect of it is simply to keep it in the hands of the Committee on Agriculture during each of the 3 years. The substitute amendment would go further and would provide an authorization for expenditures of $155 million more during the next 3 years, than in provided in the bill that has been passed by the other body.

I do not believe you could get that amount of money, and I do not think any of you think you will. I think that all you do by this is to say in effect that the Committee on Agriculture cannot review this program during the next 3 years.

I fear that it, too, emphasizes what the gentlewoman from Missouri and the gentleman from Rhode Island have both made very plain, and that is they feel our Committee on Agriculture is unfriendly to their proposal.

The gentleman suggests it is one thing to talk about making subscriptions to good causes, and that it is another thing to actually put up the money. I wonder what committee in this House "put up the money"? I wonder what committee brought the food stamp program before us? Where did it come from, if not from the Committee on Agriculture? Ours is the committee which brought this program here. Yet we are charged with simply giving mouth service and doing nothing substantial.

I do not think it is a fair charge. I believe it is hardly worthy to make that kind of charge against the Agriculture Committee that has brought this program before the House and that wants to try to keep a program going.

I do not believe that this is the effective way to get a good program. What we are doing is laying the predicate to have the committee reject the entire thing.

I believe we have brought a workable program, one that provides for a fair review, and a review that I wish the House would let us carry through.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in my remarks I did praise the gentleman his fine cooperation and for bringing this bill to the floor. I have always been happy to give public recognition to the support he has given to this program in past years. But when we look at the vote of his committee—if I recall the vote correctly the vote to bring this amended bill to the floor the vote was 19 to 14, even after these amendments were added. It is my understanding that in order to get the bill out of committee, it was necessary to put these limitations on the authorization for appropriations and to add the 20 percent cost-sharing amendment. So next year we would have to go back again and have the same fight all over again, and always we would be hit with the same limitations or a requirement for cost-sharing participation by the States such as in this case of 20 percent. Three years ago it was for 50 percent and we had to knock it out. Most of those on the gentleman's committee who voted for the restrictions in the bill are going to vote against the bill anyway, so I do not think one could say it is a sympathetic committee, because if it were, we would not have this fight on these same grounds each year the bill comes up. That is why I have said that whereas the committee always has the power to report out bills to amend this law, we should not be forced to go before an unsympathetic committee every year and be required to get a bill to continue the program.

Mr. POAGE. I do not want to speak for other members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, but as far as I am concerned, I will vote for the bill with or without the amendments.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. BELCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, if anybody was in doubt at all about this being a good amendment, I believe he would just have to change his mind when he would find the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and me both opposing it, because I believe this is one of the very few times that we happen to have been on the same side. I believe that would be about all the information he would need.

I am going to have to admit now that there are some members on the Committee on Agriculture who are not sympathetic to this program. I plead guilty as one of those. But the committee as a whole is not unsympathetic to this particular program. I have never been able to understand why they were sympathetic, but nevertheless the majority of them have been.

This program, instead of being a charity program, does away with a program for the people that actually need food, for the purpose of giving a better diet to those who already have money. I cannot understand why we should feed or give a better diet to a fellow who already has cash with which to buy his own groceries, and take away from the person who has no means whatsoever of getting commodities or any other kind of food. That is one of the reasons why I have been unsympatetic.

Another reason is that this program, as far as I can see, is going to get bigger and bigger. If we have any doubt, just look at what is happening right now. Instead of $195 million, they want $275 million, and $350 million. They want $820 million right at the very start of this program, and that is only the beginning.

Some who might think they do not have any chips in this game should stop and think that last night the House of Representatives voted down the debt ceiling bill. If we are going to continue to do that, every dollar that goes for the food stamp program is going to have to come out of somebody's private program. So those who are interested in other projects and other improvements and other expenditures which they feel are essential and good, should just stop and think that out of this budget is going to have to come money for the food stamp program. If we put a ceiling on, we are going to have to get this money from somebody.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman had 10 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I would have been happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELCHER. The gentleman had 10 minutes and I did not object at all to his statement. Would he just let me finish my statement, and if I get an additional 5 minutes, I will be glad to yield to him.

The gentleman made quite a thing of the fact that a Republican Governor up in Rhode Island was behind this program. I can let the Members in on a secret. Every Governor in the United States—Republican, Communist, or Democrat—is going to be for this program, because he will get a completely free ride for his budget. The Federal Government is going to pay for the entire thing.

On this very bill—which is going to be violently opposed by the people sponsoring the bill—there is a proposal to just make them pay 20 percent.

When they get a free ride on this program, do we not believe they are going to saddle every single thing on this program that they possibly can? On all the other programs they have to participate anywhere from 20 percent to 50 percent.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York. The gentleman took up half of my time the other day, but I know he just cannot keep still over there, so he can go ahead.

Mr. RESNICK. I am just articulate.

The gentleman pointed out that the other programs cost from 20 percent to 50 percent.

As to the commodities program, I believe those commodities are supplied free. I should like to ask the gentleman why, if he is opposed to the food stamps going free, he does not oppose the commodities going free?

Mr. BELCHER. The commodity program was set up because we had the granaries of this country just bulging with surplus commodities. We set it up as much to get rid of the surplus commodities as we did for a charitable program back home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BELCHER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BELCHER. There is another thing, Mr. Chairman. The commodity program is never going to even be a drop in the bucket compared to what this program

is going to be, when it escalates from $195 million up to $820 million by 1970.

As I said, we are going to see Republican Governors and we are going to see all of the Governors in here asking for this particular program.

That is how I felt, and how I still feel. My own State of Oklahoma has a Republican Governor, who has felt we should feed the poor people first.

Apparently the proponents of this bill would rather feed those people who already have cash to buy part of their groceries with. We prefer to feed those who have no cash at all.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I merely wish to say to the gentleman that people come to see me on this food stamp program, and they say how happy they are, because they are getting $48 or $52 or $60 a month to live on, for gas, electricity, food, heat, and light.

I do not believe that to supplement the diet of people who are receiving so little per month to live on is feeding someone who is not in need. I feel that these people are in need.

Mr. BELCHER. Would the gentleman not agree with me that a man with $52 a month is a darned sight better off than a man without anything?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. That is correct, but why eliminate those who have only $52 a month?

Mr. BELCHER. Why would the gentleman want to take care of the fellow with $52 and let the other fellow starve?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I say, let us take care of those who do not have the $52 also. Let us help them also.

Mr. BELCHER. It cannot be done under this bill. This bill stops the commodity program. When Members vote for this bill they vote to stop the commodity program.

Whom should we take care of first?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. It is my understanding that there is also a downgrading of the amount, based on the amount of the individual's income. There are criteria, or some authorization given in this program, to allow a basic commodity to go as low as 50 cents or $2.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. In all courtesy I believe I should yield now to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I should like to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that the cost of the present direct distribution program is $175 million, for the free food given out to States like his. His State has 73 counties receiving free food handouts. If the State would pay the administration costs of the food stamp program instead, the people in those counties could get a much better diet, instead of having to live on flour, dried beans, powdered milk, and a few items such as those.

Mr. BELCHER. There would be a lot of them that would not get anything under either one of those programs if we put the stamp program in.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Only if they chose not to participate, because they are now getting something free but they are not getting a proper diet—not the kind of food Americans should have for an adequate diet.

Mr. BELCHER. The commodity program would go out in Oklahoma and we prefer that program there. I assume sooner or later the State administration in Oklahoma will figure out that if you can get this for nothing, they will take it on rather than the commodity program.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Would the gentleman be willing to do without the Public Law 480 program that feeds India and all of the other countries all over the world? That is what our people are complaining about. Why feed people all over the world when you are so chintzy about feeding your own?

Mr. BELCHER. We feed those people all over the world with a commodity program. That is the only one that I voted for. I say before we send it to India and cut it off from Oklahoma and establish a program for the Middle East, I say keep the commodities in Oklahoma.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. But you are in favor of sending it abroad under the Public Law 480 program?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes. Reluctantly I have voted for the passage of Public Law 480. Of course, the passage of that law in the very beginning was for no charitable purpose at all. It was for the purpose of establishing a market for American commodities all over the world. Eventually, as we went along, we gradually saddled it up with a charitable program, too. I have gotten so much in the habit of voting for Public Law 480 that I guess I have just continued. I do not want to get in the habit of voting for the food stamp plan, because I might continue that, too.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I want to point out in answer to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] the primary difference between the food stamp program and the commodity program is that the commodity program was a surplus disposal program. That is why there was no participation by the States. Under the food stamp program, section 3 defines food as any food product except alcoholic beverages and tobacco and those foods and meats which are imported.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BELCHER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BELCHER. I yield further to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. There is a vast difference between what you can buy in the food stamp program and a commodity program.

Secondly, as I pointed out in the report at page 31, in nearly every other program the States and local governments pay about 30 or 40 percent of the cost. We are not setting a precedent by asking the States to pay 20 percent.

Mr. BELCHER. Members of the House, I have only 1 minute left. I think first we should defeat the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] and sustain the committee amendment. I think those of you who are in favor of the food stamp plan will do well to do that, because if you start forcing this food stamp plan too fast, I think you may wind up on the wrong end of the horns. So the best thing you can do is let the committee take another look at it 1 year from now.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BELCHER. I will if I have any more time.

Mr. WYDLER. I want to clear up one thing, because I heard the gentlewoman say that this is a program for free food. I am trying to get clear in my own mind, is this food really free? Does not somebody have to pay for it?

Mr. BELCHER. If you need $16 worth of groceries and you put up $10 in cash, the Federal Government puts up $6. They give you $16 worth of food stamps. To the extent of the difference between $10 and $16, that is free.

Mr. WYDLER. It is free to the consumer, but somebody has to pay that $6, does he not?

Mr. BELCHER. That comes out of the taxpayer, and everything that comes out of the taxpayer is supposedly free.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to seek unanimous consent to limit the time on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that everyone is interested in this question, most of whom have spoken thereon, and Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the committee amendment and all amendments and substitutes thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, as well as substitute amendment thereto, close within the period of 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, is it in order to advise the House that the United Arab Republic has just notified the United Nations that it has accepted the cease-fire?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MATSUNAGA yielded his time to Mr. RESNICK.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RANDALL yielded his time to Mrs. SULLIVAN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. PUCINSKI].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PUCINSKI yielded his time to Mr. RESNICK.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARRETT yielded his time to Mrs. SULLIVAN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make only one point here in opposition to the amendment, and that is with reference to the level of authorizations in future years.

We are now funding this program at a $195 million level. I just cannot see how we can raise this authorization to $350 million in view of the financial plight we are in. Sometime, somewhere, we have got to hold the line. We cannot do it alone on the Appropriations Committee. This is the time to hold the line and I for one do not like the idea of shooting the moon, so to speak, at authorizing time and then expecting our Appropriations Committee to take the heat at funding time.

Mr. Chairman, in 1965 this program cost us $36 million. In 1966 it cost us $70 million. In 1967 it is projected that it will cost us $125 million.

And, Mr. Chairman, if this bill is enacted into law we will, I am sure, come up with $195 million in the Agriculture appropriation conference report since it was knocked out on a point of order in the bill we passed last Tuesday.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the gentleman's substitute amendment which provides for a much larger authorization should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VIGORITO].

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island, and against the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment, and in favor of the committee amendment. I supported the creation of the food stamp program. It is a fine program. I want to provide adequate authorizations for its expansion.

The $275 million for the year 1969 is a little excessive in view of the fact that at the current rate of expenditures we are spending $160 million. The Committee on Appropriations brought in $195 million for the new year starting July 1.

To increase the authorization to $275 million 1 year later would be speeding the effort probably faster than new areas could be brought in. The Senate has approved a bill extending the Food Stamp Act for 3 years authorizing $200 million for fiscal 1968, $225 million for 1969, and $250 million for 1970. I oppose the amendment authorizing $275 million for 1969 and $350 million for 1970.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN].

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I can speak on this amendment inasmuch as I have already spoken on the amendment. I therefore defer my time to a subsequent amendment.

As I understand, the motion was offered on the pending amendment and all subsequent amendments. I would ask to be recognized later on for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] for 3 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman who brought up the question of the increase in cost each year in the food stamp program, I think the gentleman knows from being on the Committee on Agriculture all these years that the reason the appropriation was low the first year was because it was an experimental pilot program which included only eight counties, and then it was expanded to 41 pilot projects and it has grown year by year as its advantages became evident to more and more municipalities. That is the reason we have these escalating amounts each year in the appropriations; because each year more and more counties and more and more people are coming in after they have been certified.

As I stated before, 232 counties which have already been approved are waiting to come into the program until there are sufficient appropriations. There are 140 counties that have made applications that have not yet been certified and approved, because the funds are not yet available. Nine States are not yet in the program at all.

In the district of the gentleman from Illinois, there have been requests for the food stamp plan, but it has not yet been put into operation there. So the gentleman's own people do want to get into the program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to show the Members these voluminous petitions I have received. These are from people in the city of St. Louis, the only community in the whole State of Missouri which so far has been getting food stamps. My constituents want them, and they want them continued. They have sent me these petitions signed with their names and addresses, and I am most impressed by this outpouring of support from my city.

I hope we can vote for the St Germain amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma brought out in the exchange here this afternoon a very important point with regard to this program. We have persons who cannot qualify for the food stamp program, but who do need food. In my own county, for example, the county commissioners are in favor of inaugurating the program, and they have passed a resolution to that effect, but they hesitate to implement this resolution because they have been informed that many of the people who today are receiving surplus commodity food in order to keep body and soul together would not be able to qualify for food stamp money or qualify under the food stamp program provisions.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, at the proper time, not today, I intend to offer either a bill or an amendment to the existing law so that we can provide that those counties who want to come into the food stamp program, and qualify in it, also will be able to keep at least some residue of the surplus commodity program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the general debate on this bill took place a few weeks ago and we went through this then.

Very briefly, I would like to tell my colleagues just what this is all about. It is very simple and very clear—these amendments were offered by the minority side to virtually gut this food stamp bill.

Now you heard my distinguished chairman of the committee say that he would vote for this bill with the committee amendments or without the committee amendments. You heard my distinguished colleague, the minority member of the committee say he was going to vote against it.

I think this is very simple—that they put these amendments on so that they could go back home and say, "We voted for the food stamp program." But they put in these hookers that are just going to ruin the program. That is the long and short of it.

I would like to say in defense of my distinguished committee chairman that he fought hard in committee to get this bill out and that the only way he could get the bill out was with these crippling amendments.

I do not want anybody to have any allusions about how this bill got out—that is the only way it got out.

This amendment and the following amendment, which I hope we will have a little more time to debate, I will say again, if we do not defeat these amendments, we will be ruining the food stamp program.

Mr. CONYERS Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter from the Wayne County Department of Social Service which covers Detroit in the administration of this program.

I want to point out to the Members of the House that if the 20-percent provision is carried, it is estimated that it will cost at least $600,000 to administer the food stamp program and it would lead them to consider abandoning the whole program.

Mr. RESNICK. I thank my colleague.

We have all received letters and we are all aware of this. This is just a device to gut and ruin the food stamp program.

If the minority Members are so interested in the States sharing, I suggest that the States share in the commodity programs and I suggest also that the reason my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, voted for public law 480 is that he just happens to have a few wheatgrowers in his district.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, there are two issues before us—one is the question of review. I think it is quite clear that this Committee should have the opportunity to review this program.

The committee amendment does give us an opportunity to review this program annually. Unless the committee amendment is adopted, we will have no such opportunity.

The other question is the question of the amounts which you want to authorize for expenditure. When you authorize expenditures, you place your appropriations committee in an embarrassing position if they do not appropriate and you place the House in an embarrassing position when we create an obligation that is beyond the size which we intend to pay.

I would call your attention to the fact that the amount authorized in this substitute is 10 times the amount that was actually spent just 5 years before. That ration of increase seems to me is unreasonable.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ST GERMAIN and Mr. BELCHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 90, noes 143.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. SULLIVAN and Mr. BELCHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 148, noes 91.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 3, insert the following: "SEC. 2. Section 15 of the Food Stamp Act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"'(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each State shall be responsible for financing, from funds available to the State or political subdivision thereof, 20 per centum of the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments. Each State shall transfer such sums to, and they shall be made a part of, the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. Each State shall transfer such sums to such ammount within one calendar month following the calendar month in which the coupon allotments are issued to eligible households. The provisions of this subsection shall not be effective for any coupon allotments issued prior to July 1, 1969, to enable each State to take such action as is necessary under the statutes of the States to comply with the provisions of this subsection.'"

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the second committee amendment. I appreciate the sincerity of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in wanting to improve the food stamp program. I am glad that some of those on the committee who opposed the program 3 years ago are for it now—provided this amendment is adopted. However, I feel that they are placing too high a premium on their offer to vote for this bill.

The amendment to require the States to pay 20 percent of the value of the bonus coupons issued to participants in the food stamp program is a little brother to the amendment we defeated 3 years ago to require 50-percent sharing. It comes from the same ancestry—that is, from a sense of suspicion about the food stamp program, if not actual opposition.

It is significant, I believe, that this amendment carried in committee largely with the votes of members of the committee who then voted against the bill even with this amendment. Are they for the bill? No indeed. Are they for the food stamp program? Not at all. I think most of those in the Committee on Agriculture who voted for this amendment and then voted against the bill do not have the food stamp program in their districts and presumably think the rest of us should not have it either.

EXCELLENT CAMPAIGN ISSUE

The record is clear that those States which have been making the greatest use of the food stamp program since it was inaugurated by President Kennedy in 1961 will not be able to participate if this amendment prevails. We have heard from many of the Governors and welfare directors to that effect. So a vote for this amendment is, in effect, a vote against the food stamp program in most of the 41 States and the District of Columbia now participating. Fortunately, it will not be possible to kill this program through a secret or nonrecorded vote. For, if this amendment is not defeated in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, it will be subject to a rollcall in the House.

Let me say very frankly that I cannot think of a better issue to take to the people in an election campaign than this food stamp program. I placed in the RECORD on May 15, during general debate, a list of the States which pass along to their participating counties all of the costs—I repeat, all of the costs—now assessed to the States for the food stamp program. I hope the Members will look at that list before they vote on this amendment. I hope they will note that in at least 13 States every cent of additional cost you shoulder upon the States for the food stamp program is going to be passed down to the county courthouse in those counties which have the food stamp program, or which want it.

COSTS ASSESSED ON COUNTIES

The Members know—or should know, from the material I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix on March 14—which counties in their districts have the food stamp program now, and which are scheduled to have it shortly. They were all listed by congressional district. Just compare that list, Mr. Chairman, with the information I placed in the RECORD on May 15 on how the States now assess their share of the substantial administrative costs of the food stamp program within each State, and the Members will have some realization of what this amendment would mean to Clay County or Jefferson County or any county in terms of higher local taxes to meet the costs of the food stamp program. Any Member who wants to add a million dollars or more a year to local taxes in his district through this amendment is welcome to his principles.

But I do not go along with the Republicans and some of the Democrats, who may not have the food stamp program in their districts, who are trying to make it impossible for St. Louis to have it. Those Members who might succeed in forcing us to a rollcall on this amendment—unless we defeat it here and now—undoubtedly have good reasons to give to their constituents for the susbtantial increase in the costs of local government such an amendment would mean to such States as Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, Minnesota, Kansas, Iowa, Colorado, California—there are 13 States which pass along to the counties every cent of the cost of the food stamp program. There are 16 others which make the counties pay, on an average, about 50 percent of all of the State costs for the food stamp program. In only 12 States would this amendment be a charge on the State itself. It is on page H5424 of the May 15 RECORD.

There are food stamp costs already assessed upon the State and localities, and they are substantial. One of the tables on page H5424 of Monday's RECORD shows what those administrative costs will be in the 1970 fiscal year if the program expands as contemplated. At that time, the States would be paying more than $22 million in administrative costs. Under this amendment we are now considering, we would be adding three times that much to the States' expenses, or a total of $86 million. Let those who want

to kill the food stamp program vote for this amendment; all the rest of us will vote "no."

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. DWYER. I join the gentlewoman in her opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the position of the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] that the proposed requirement that States pay 20 percent of the cost of the food stamp program should be eliminated from the committee bill.

This is a critically important issue in my judgment. Its fate will determine whether the program will be free to provide maximum help to people who need it most or will be significantly limited in its impact on poverty.

Ordinarily, Mr. Chairman, I would support language requiring State sharing in the costs of Federal grant programs. As a general principle, it is a sound one. It has the effect of encouraging States to accept their responsibilities for the welfare of their own people, and it introduces an element of prudence in the spending of public funds.

But as a general principle, too, it is subject to certain exceptions. The food stamp program, I believe, should be such an exception—for the following reasons:

First, there is already a substantial degree of cost-sharing built into the food stamp program by virtue of the fact that issuance of free stamps is conditioned on the cash purchase by recipient families of an even higher value of the stamps. In addition, State and local governments must now bear the costs of program administration which are estimated at 7 percent of the total value of the bonus coupons.

Second, in its first 2 years or so of operation, the food stamp program has demonstrated a marked degree of success, free of waste, abuse or scandal. To impose, now, a requirement that States pay 20 percent of the cost of stamps would discourage expansion and would probably result in the abandonment of the program by States for whom the added costs would be too heavy a burden. Almost inevitably, the States least able to pay the added share of costs would be the States whose people need the program most.

Third, unlike many Federal grant-in-aid programs, the food stamp program allows for little, if any, discretion in the use of funds. Regulations are both strict and enforcible. As a result, there is little incentive for States to compete for a growing share of Federal funds, even without the restraint of an additional cost-sharing requirement.

Fourth, the exclusive beneficiaries of the food stamp program are low-income families who cannot otherwise afford to provide adequate, well-balanced diets for their children. No unnecessary restrictions should be imposed on this highly desirable national objectives.

Fifth, in a majority of the States participating in the food stamp program, all or a part of the additional costs resulting from the proposed amendment for State cost sharing would be borne by counties or other local units of government rather than by the States themselves. In 16 States at present, the costs of certification and coupon issuance are shared by the State and local governments involved. In 13 States, including my own State of New Jersey, those costs are met entirely by the county or local governments. Consequently, the depressing effects of the proposed requirement would be even greater in these States.

At a time when poverty is still very much with us and when the Nation has undertaken a commitment to eliminate it, the Congress should be encouraging a program of the high caliber of the food stamp program rather than restraining it. In New Jersey, four counties have been participating for some time; two other counties joined the program last month, and two more, including my own Union County, have undertaken the program this month. Adding program costs to the already substantial administrative costs would only discourage further progress.

The food stamp program, I believe, is one of the best Federal programs we have. It is efficient, it is effective; it is humane. Not all Federal programs, unfortunately, can make this claim. I voted for it when the program was first enacted in 1964. I have watched it since and been pleased with what I have seen. I was delighted when Union County decided to join the growing number of New Jersey counties participating in the program.

The food stamp program is essentially a welfare program. But it is a program that works—without cheating, without waste, without embarrassment to the recipient.

There are several reasons why the food stamp program is so effective.

First, it is simple and it is private. With a minimum of redtape, welfare, and other low-income families need only buy the stamps at a bank and redeem them at grocery stores.

Second, it is an almost foolproof way of preventing abuses. Unlike cash, food stamps can be used only to buy food. And the food cannot include luxury items, imported products, alcoholic beverages, tobacco, household goods, or other nonfood items.

Third, it is most beneficial to the neediest families. It increases the amount of food poor families consume by an average of 50 percent.

Fourth, it discourages waste in the use of welfare payments because it provides a bonus for those who devote a greater share of their welfare checks or other available cash to the feeding of their families.

The food-stamp program is a national program. It can help greatly to ease the burdens of local welfare programs, and to make them function more effectively. It has been good for farmers, and it has increased the sale of food in participating stores by as much as 10 percent. Most importantly, it has been of direct benefit to the poor.

I hope the House will approve the food stamp bill without the cost-sharing amendment.

(Mrs. DWYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, as I stated previously, I wish to associate myself completely and wholeheartedly with the position which has been taken by the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. In view of the fact that the distinguished gentlewoman is opposed to this amendment, as well as the second amendment which has been proposed thereto, it is my hope that both amendments will be defeated and that all members of the committee will support H.R. 1318 as introduced.

However, Mr. Chairman, I shall ask the distinguished gentlewoman this question: As the distinguished gentlewoman pointed out in her statement, 13 States which now have the food stamp program—

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No; 41 States have it. In 13 States which have it, however, I said all of the costs were passed along to the counties which participated.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentlewoman will yield further, that is what I was starting to ask—is it not true that in these 13 States, the added costs proposed by the committee would go to the local courthouses, not to the State itself; that in those States the burden would be on local taxpayers entirely?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The gentleman is correct.

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am completely and wholeheartedly in support of H.R. 1318 as introduced by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], and I oppose the amendments added to the bill by the Committee on Agriculture. These amendments would seriously harm the program; one of them—requiring 20-percent sharing by the States of the value of the extra coupons given to the low-income families purchasing the food stamps—would probably force Philadelphia back on the direct surplus distribution program which was so inadequate and unsatisfactory.

Mrs. SULLIVAN, who serves with distinction as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing, of which I am chairman, of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, has always been deeply concerned with the plight of poor families struggling to provide their children with at least the minimum comforts of life. She is compassionate and humane, but she is also extremely realistic and she is a great enemy of wasteful spending. I know that very well from her out-

standing work on housing legislation. She was the author of the low-income homeownership plan which we wrote into law last year and which the Republican Party has been trying to adopt. She believes in aiding people to help themselves up the ladder to better living standards.

FINE RESULTS IN PHILADELPHIA

Besides working hard on housing legislation to aid the poor, she also developed the food stand idea as a means of assuring decent, minimum diets for low-income families. I am proud to say that I have voted with her and supported her on this legislation ever since she introduced her first food stamp bill 13 years ago.

As the Representative for the First Congressional District of Pennsylvania, located in the city of Philadelphia, I have firsthand knowledge of the fine results of the food stamp program in my city. We have only had the program in operation for 1 year—since May 1966—but already we have seen the vast difference in effectiveness and helpfulness of this program compared to the previous program of giving some surplus food packages to the needy each month from special municipal depots.

When there was nothing better available, the direct distribution program helped many families which otherwise would have had very little to eat; but, on the whole, it was not a program anyone could regard with pride or satisfaction. The people who went to the distribution centers for the free food had to carry home large sacks of flour and cornmeal, powdered milk, powdered eggs, lard, and things of that nature—not a balanced diet, certainly, and not a very appetizing one either. It was demeaning and somewhat cruel for the poor people who had to stand in line for these packages.

Under the food stamp program, on the other hand, the people whose incomes and family size make them eligible for food assistance buy their food in the regular grocery stores. They can choose from the wide variety of domestic food products available, and thus give their children balanced, healthy, attractive meals. And they pay most of the cost of this program themselves.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS ARE STRICT

As I understand it, the cost to the Federal Government is about the same for both programs of food assistance—one which allows families to eat properly and well and the other which just hands out a few limited items in surplus.

I am mindful of the fact that under the direct distribution program there were widespread abuses which the General Accounting Office uncovered in special studies made in various parts of the country, including Philadephia, where the extreme difficulties of maintaining up-to-date certification records for free food eligibility were spotlighted. The main objective of the direct distribution program was just to unload a lot of surplus foods at one time, with no thought to nutritional standards or even whether families could use the flour and cornmeal and lard and other commodities.

The situation is completely different under the food-stamp program. The eligibility requirements are strictly enforced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Pennsylvania Department of Public Assistance. The families which participate are checked and rechecked periodically to assure continued eligibility and to make sure that the food-stamp purchase requirements are correct. The certification is done by trained social workers.

PEOPLE THEMSELVES PAY MOST OF THE COST

Philadelphia has approximately 50,000 persons from low-income families enjoying the good, well-rounded, nutritious diets the food stamp program makes possible. The people themselves pay out of their own money for an average of two-thirds of the dollar value of the coupons they receive, with only one-third representing a subsidy. Yet this one-third, averaging about $5.50 per month per person, means the difference between well-fed and undernourished citizens.

The people in need, for whom we must have compassion, have informed me personally, as well as by letters and telegrams, of their wholehearted support for the program and their real concern and fear that the program would be killed if the States have to assume part of the cost. It would be a gross injustice to adopt the crippling amendments offered by the committee.

If 20 percent of the value of the bonus coupons is assessed upon Pennsylvania, as proposed in the pending committee amendment, it will cost an addition $660,000 a year for the Philadelphia project alone, at present levels of participation. For the entire State, this cost would be about $3,000,000 a year at current levels and $5,500,000 to $6,000,000 a year at the program levels projected for the 1970 fiscal year, when the 20 percent sharing requirement would take effect under the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment must be defeated. It was added to the bill largely through the votes of members of the committee who are against the food stamp program and who voted against it, perhaps because many of them do not have the program operating in their own districts and are therefore not as aware as we are of its dramatic effectiveness in upgrading nutritional standards for low-income families.

On this vote, I will stand beside the gentlewoman from Missouri who pioneered the food stamp program, and who has worked so hard to make it the fine program it now is. I favor Mrs. SULLIVAN'S bill as introduced.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, a moment ago I voted for the committee amendment limiting the food stamp program to a 1-year authorization. I supported the committee position that there should be an annual review of this program, particularly in its early years. I think this amendment should satisfy any Member who is concerned that the costs of the program will not be properly reviewed or that its operations will not be sufficiently supervised.

The adoption of the committee's first amendment only deepens my opposition to the second committee amendment now before us. This amendment, which would require a 20-percent participation by the States in the cost of the food stamp program, must be defeated. I do not question the sincerity of any member of the Committee on Agriculture, and I deeply regret the necessity to disagree with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. But I am persuaded that the adoption of this committee amendment would strike at the heart of one of the most successful programs that has ever been undertaken by the United States for the assistance of low-income families.

The food stamp program encourages and assists families of poor or modest means to purchase and provide for themselves a more healthy and nutritious diet. Its dividends will be found in the improved health and well-being, the greater efficiency and productivity, the better and longer life of hundreds of thousands of our citizens. Many of these citizens will be recipients or the dependents of recipients of public assistance. For many years we have heard complaints—and not always unjustified complaints—that some public assistance funds designed to feed and clothe and house dependent parents and their children have not been properly directed to those purposes. One of the great benefits of this program lies in the encouragement, indeed the healthy pressures it applies, to channel such assistance funds to the most basic and beneficial use: purchase of healthy and nutritious food. This is a fine and effective program and it would be tragic to cripple it in its infancy.

Some of my colleagues have expressed concern about the cost of this program.

I must say—with no disrespect to any Member of the House, that it concerns me deeply when some Members of the House on each side of the aisle vote for billions of dollars in foreign programs—as I do—and billions of dollars for domestic and military programs—as I do—and yet these Members find the opportunity and the necessity to plead for economy in Government only when it deals with something like food for low-income families. Perhaps these Members might consider whether it is entirely conscionable to economize with the health and well-being of hundreds of thousands of children and aged when the American Republic is at the peak of prosperity for the vast majority of her citizens.

How can we, in this country, at this time, justify denying a healthy and nutrious diet to any of our citizens? The suggestion is especially repugnant when it is within the relatively easy power of our society to provide for this most basic of human needs—as indeed it is.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. I would point out to the gentleman that if this amendment is adopted it would provide about $39 million more in funds. This is not an economy amendment, it is a responsibility amendment to the States. This 20 percent is something that turns out to be about $39 million.

Mr. FOLEY. I wish I could agree with the gentleman's evaluation. I think on the contrary it will lead some States to completely remove themselves from the program, because some counties that may be benefited by this program will not have sufficient strength in their legislature to adopt the 20-percent contribution, or because the State in question simply is without sufficient resources under their present circumstances to go ahead with the 20-percent contribution.

I would remind the gentleman that many Members on both sides of the aisle have introduced bills to provide for direct support to the States and municipalities, from Federal revenues.

The so-called Heller plan is widely supported in this House, but many of the same Members who say they support revenue sharing are now demanding instead cost sharing by the States I find their positions inconsistent.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, again I must express regret at the turn of this debate. The implication is repeatedly made that those of us who favor the committee amendments are opposed to the food stamp program, and that just simply is not true.

So, for the third time this afternoon permit me to say that I expect to vote for this whether we adopt the amendments or whether we do not. I hope we will adopt this amendment. I think the amendment is a very fine amendment. I realize there are many Members here who disagree with me. There are many Members here who do not believe in the federal system of States. There are those who believe in a strong national government with departments or provinces as administrative agencies. I do not accept that philosophy of government.

I believe the States of this Union are and should remain a vital part in policymaking, as well as mere administrative agencies.

If I am going to ask that my State have a part in policymaking, I feel that I must in fairness accept for my State the obligation to pay a share of the costs.

As far as I am concerned, I am willing for the State of Texas to pay a share of the cost of the food stamp program. I believe we should, and I know that we will.

If there are States that feel it is more important for them to get something from the Federal Government than it is to care for their poor, I can only say that I would not want to be here representing that kind of State. I represent a State, and I am proud that I represent a State, which believes that it should have a part in the policymaking of our Government, and is willing to carry its share of the burdens of our Government. There is not a State in this Union that is so poor that it cannot pay 1 dollar out of 5 to feed these poor people.

Every State in this Union can contribute this modest amount—and it is not the poor States that are coming here pleading their poverty—it is the rich States who are coming here this afternoon and pleading that they ought not to be burdened with even a small share of the obligation to care for their own needy.

Now I do not come from the richest State in the Union, and I do not come from the poorest State in the Union, but I come from a State which is willing to pay its bills and is willing to take care of its poor people, and I am willing to take care of them and I am willing for them to have the food stamp program. I think this is a better program than the other programs we have used.

But I know that if we want to have efficiency in administration, the best way to get it is to put in some provision of responsibility on the part of the local people.

I am pleading with those who believe in control by the States and then I am pleading with those who do not care whether their States control anything or not but who are interested in seeing that this program is honestly and efficiently and effectively administered.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will ask unanimous consent that he may have 3 additional minutes when his time expires.

Mr. POAGE. I would suggest to the gentlewoman that I do not believe I need any more time.

Mrs. KELLY. But I would like the gentleman to have additional time so that I may ask him some questions.

First of all, I would like to know where the money is coming from to pay for the food stamp program.

Mr. POAGE. It is coming from the taxpayers of America.

Mrs. KELLY. Is it not budgeted under section 32?

Mr. POAGE. I beg the gentlewoman's pardon?

Mrs. KELLY. Is it not carried in the budget under section 32 out of a special fund consisting of one-third of all customs receipts?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, the section 32 money comes from the tariffs.

Mrs. KELLY. That is my understanding. Now how much money is in that fund at the present time?

Mr. POAGE. I could not tell you that.

Mrs. KELLY. I will tell you—it is about $570 million for the 1968 fiscal year, plus a $300 million carryover. Therefore, is there not more than enough money in this fund to pay for the modest cost of this program to help the poor people who need it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Is there not more than enough money in this special aid-to-agriculture fund to pay for this 20-percent assessment that you are trying to charge the States for the food stamp program?

Mr. POAGE. I think undoubtedly there is enough money to pay the 20 percent. There is enough money in the U.S. Treasury to pay it. There is enough money in the Federal old age assistance fund to pay it. There is enough money in the road fund to pay it. But that does not get to the proposition of who should pay it. The people who should pay it are the people of the States of this Union who should contribute something for their own welfare and to their own welfare.

Mrs. KELLY. I am very happy to say that I come from one of those States that is supposed to be a "rich" State. My State gives over $15 billion to help support some of the other States of this Nation. I am very proud that my State of New York can contribute over $15 billion to help pay for these things that are needed in common by all of our people, wherever they live.

Therefore, I say to you: The committee amendment is wrong. The food stamp program is to be paid for out of a fund which was established originally in 1935, when there was a depression and when there was a need to help both the farmer and the city unemployed. That was what section 32 was intended to do. There is a need for the use of these funds now, also, to help those who are in need in the United States today, to obtain a good nutritious diet—to get the proper food. That is a proper use for section 32 money.

Mr. POAGE. The gentlewoman suggested how happy she was that her State was able to contribute to the other States in the Union and to the poor people of the other States of the Union. I see the gentlewoman on her feet—did I misquote her?

Mrs. KELLY. No, the gentleman did not misquote me. The States should pay taxes to the best of their ability and, of course, I am very willing for them to do that. But, it is not fair that States which already pay so much should be forced to pay an additional assessment of 20 percent for the food stamps. It is not right.

Mr. POAGE. I do not think it is fair for any of these States to have to pay for the debts of other States. I am in full agreement with the lady.

Down on the Brazos River we have poor folks and those of us who live there making our living along with those people ought to contribute in some proportion to help those people.

This bill requires only 20 cents out of every dollar. This bill requires only that you put up four nickels and it says that Uncle Sam will put up 80 cents. That is not a very heavy burden on anyone, but it strikes at a proposition that its fundamental, and that is the problem of local self-government, which is the best government ever devised by man and is the most effective and certainly the most efficient and frugal government that you can get. If you want to prevent fraud and corruption, you are going to keep this program as close to the people as you possibly can, and the way to make peo-

ple understand that a program is close to them is to make them get out their pocketbook and at least put a few nickels in the box.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a list I am glancing through right now—a long three-page list—of domestic benefit programs of the Department of Agriculture which do not require any matching by State or local government tax funds. Let me read a few of those programs:

There is the feed grain program, the wheat marketing certificate program, the upland cotton program, the cropland adjustment program, the agricultural conservation program, the cropland conservation program, the REA loan program, the Farmers Home Administration loan and grant programs, the perishable commodities surplus removal program—section 32—Soil Conservation Service programs, the whole price support program, and I could go on and on. Would you be willing that your State should pay 20 percent of the benefits from each of those programs?

Mr. POAGE. I do not think I would on every one. Most of these programs, unlike the food stamp program, are for the purpose of improving the general, not individual, welfare. But I think I would on those programs which benefit only certain individuals or certain areas.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. How about the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance? Should the oil States pay a portion of that?

Mr. POAGE. I would only wonder if it were not possible for the opponents of the committee amendment to present some arguments in favor of their proposal? I had supposed that there were arguments in favor of their position. The oil depletion allowance is, in my judgment, a sound and wise tax law. I have very rarely heard it seriously criticized in an impassionate manner. But regardless of its merits or demerits the depletion allowance has exactly as much to do with this question as the question of selling gold from Alaska has to do with it. It is utterly unrelated, and there can be but one purpose for bringing in a question of that kind, and that is to try to bolster up a very poor case that cannot stand on its own merits.

(Mr. KLEPPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the committee amendment to the Food Stamp Act of 1964—H.R. 1318—as reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

There was considerable opposition within the committee to extension of the Food Stamp Act in any form and this is reflected in the minority views set forth in House Report No. 189. It is my own opinion that it would have been impossible to obtain a favorable report on this legislation without inclusion of the provision for 20-percent coupon allotment cost sharing by the States and the 1-year extension and $195 million cost limitations. Quite clearly, there was little or no sentiment within the committee for making the food-stamp plan a permanent, open-end program.

There is ample precedent for State sharing of costs in Federal welfare and assistance programs. In fact, the States are required to shoulder much more than 20 percent of the costs of most of these programs. Application of the Federal-State cost sharing program to the Food Stamp Act would, in my opinion, help to insure more efficient administration of the program and would, at the same time, be an effective safeguard against abuses.

The $195 million authorization for fiscal year 1968 is, I believe, more than adequate. And here is why, in fiscal 1965, although $60 million was appropriated for the food stamp plan, only $35.6 million was used. In fiscal 1966, the appropriation was $100 million, with $70.5 million actually expended. In fiscal 1967, the authorization was for $200 million, with $139.5 million appropriated. Department of Agriculture estimates are that between $120 million and $125 million will be used.

The decision to limit extension of the program to 1 year is sound. This will give the Congress another year to study the operation. With a prospective budget deficit for fiscal 1968 that may fall somewhere within the $20 billion to $30 billion range and with vital American interests threatened in many parts of the world, it seems to me that this is no time to commit ourselves to further long-term, costly, nondefense expenditures.

I am not greatly impressed by the argument that the food stamp plan serves to strengthen farm prices. In fact, farm prices declined steadily during the very period when food stamp expenditures were being sharply increased. For that reason, I believe that costs of the plan should properly be charged to public welfare, rather than agriculture.

Another year of experience with the food stamp plan may develop procedures for its improvement and justify some further extension and expansion.

For these reasons, I support this amendment to H.R. 1318, as reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] for having conceived this program and staying with it for many, many years. I hope that you have success in a continuation of this program. It is an excellent program.

Second, I am on the Agriculture Committee. However, I cannot congratulate the committee for the work it has done on this bill. I am not in favor of the two amendments that will be in the bill because it ultimately will kill the bill. We seem to have an idea that people on welfare or people receiving benefits are well fed. That is not so.

There are 30 or 40 million people in this country who eat very, very little meat—if any at all. I would like to read here a little note that I received from an old couple back home. It says:

Congressman JOSEPH VIGORITO.

DEAR JOE: It is a pleasure to know you as our favorite Congressman even takes time to recognize small folks like ourselves. Thank God for you and Senator Dirksen who was a champion of the Put the Bible and Prayer back in the Schools. Joe, I have been very ill with pneumonia for nearly a month, lost 22½ lbs, am trying to eat so I can get better, but Joe it is hard for me to get red meat, as it is too expensive for us folks who are on Old Age Welfare, my wife is a Diabetic, we get a grant of $47.00 every 15 days, and my wife gets $6.00 for dietic foods, I get Social Security $52.00 a month; $50.00 goes for rent leaving $2.00 for extra food a month, so you see the chances we have, we are God-fearing folks. God Bless you Joe.

Your friends,

TOM and DOROTHY BALDWIN.

There are at least 5 million—if not 10 million—senior citizens in the United States who are not getting proper food.

The day after the last election, in the morning, as I was coming off the porch, an old lady was there to greet me. She congratulated me on my victory and then said:

Congressman, please see if you can do something about getting us more food.

We are the richest Nation in the world. I am surprised to see so many Members who, deep down in their hearts, are against this food stamp plan. If they had a chance to kill it without having their names put on the RECORD, I am sure they would.

In the next 50 hours I am sure most of us are going to eat a steak or a lobster. Please, with every bite, remember there are people in the United States who do not know what it is to eat a steak.

I am on the Agricultural Committee, and I go along with most of its programs. I believe they are good programs. But I can say this, that if this food stamp plan is defeated, come what may, when these programs for cotton and tobacco and peanuts and wheat come up, I will vote against them. I will do whatever I can to defeat them.

(Mr. VIGORITO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, if the committee amendments to H.R. 1318 were to promise greater efficiency and more economy without imperiling the objectives of the food stamp program, I would not hesitate to point in their support.

I cannot subscribe to the proposed revision of a program which admittedly must be continued, but for which no one can guarantee successful continuation if the amendments were to be adopted.

The Committee on Agriculture in its report on H.R. 1318 has "commended the care with which the food stamp program has been organized and administered." Those are the committee's own words. The report then sets out to destroy arguments against the proposal to require participating States to accept 20 percent of the cost now borne exclusively by the Federal Government.

I applaud the committee for its thorough study incident to its final recommendations, but my own conclusion is that the study was not as thorough as it should be, else H.R. 1318 would have been reported out exactly as written by our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. She has familiarized herself with every facet of this program. She lived with its possibilities long before the Food Stamp Act of 1964 became law, and she has full knowledge of its economic and fiscal as well as its humanitarian implications.

If the committee is correct in assuming that the States have an obligation to accept a share of the cost of financing the bonus stamps, I would suggest that it has chosen a poor time to make the shift. To administer a program of this magnitude required considerable planning on both Federal and State levels, and to call a change of signals when the operation is being conducted in a smooth and responsible manner would be neither wise nor productive.

Certainly it would be illogical to impose an unexpected burden on individual States when Federal taxes leave little to cover urgent operating expenses. The State of Pennsylvania was one of the first to substitute the food stamp program for the direct distribution of surplus foods, anld we have gone to considerable effort and cost to set up and carry out the program in the most expeditious and efficient manner possible. Under the proposed amendments, Pennsylvania would be forced to contribute an estimated $2,835,297 on a matching fund basis during the coming fiscal year.

To recognize the impact of the proposed change in the law, will you please listen to the following communication from the Honorable Max Rosenn, Pennsylvania's secretary of public welfare:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
Harrisburg, Pa., April 12, 1967.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
The House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: H.R. 1318, the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as reported out by the Committee on Agriculture, is unacceptable to this Department. We are requesting your support in opposing the amendment requiring States to pay 20% of the cost of food stamps starting 1970.

Pennsylvania was one of the first States to substitute the Food Stamp Program for the direct distribution of surplus foods. Starting in Fayette County in 1961, the program has expanded operations to 29 counties, with 12 more to be added this fiscal year. Currently over 166,000 persons, slightly less that half of whom are also receiving public assistance, are participating in the program. As of the end of January 1967, over 31 million dollars worth of free food had been made available through this system without any cost to the Commonwealth except for some sharing in the expenses of administration. H.R. 1318 would now impose new State costs in excess of $1.5 million a year, and additional amounts if the program is extended throughout the State as we now plan. We believe that such required State expenditures would jeopardize the continuance of any Food Stamp Program in Pennsylvania. We are therefore recommending that the amendment inserted by the Agriculture Committee requiring State participation be deleted so that as at present no State contribution is expected for the cost of food stamps.

It is important to note that the Food Stamp Program as originally conceived was an agricultural program and not a welfare program. If a change in objectives is contemplated we would urge that the Food Stamp Program separate from other public assistance programs be abolished, and that the Federal funds available for the Food Stamp Program be appropriated to DHEW to augment State funds for public assistance payments. In this way State expenditures could earn additional Federal funds and thus strengthen the effectiveness of the basic welfare programs for low income families.

The Food Stamp Program is an effective means of increasing the available funds for food purchases for low income families. If it is to be continued we urge your support in eliminating the amendment inserted by the Agricuture Committee.

Sincerely yours,

MAX ROSENN.

Mr. Chairman, I shall also insert letters from officials of counties in the 22d Congressional District, where 12,165 families are participating in the food-stamp program. Estimated costs of bonus coupons to be used by those citizens during fiscal 1968 is $854,088, which is actually far less than might have been anticipated when the law was passed in 1964. Our economy is rising and we look to the day when many more of the present recipients of food stamp benefits will be able to sustain themselves without this assistance.

Meanwhile we most surely do not want to expose them to the hardships and dietary deficiencies that haunted so many of our people before the food stamp plan was inaugurated. I am confident that no member of the committee which reported out the amended version of H.R. 1318 would be willing to inflict a return to these conditions on affected families, yet this is the situation that would be created with the changes in the law that have been recommended.

Maybe we all should get just a little more realistic about our position with respect to the food stamp program before there is a vote to reduce Federal participation or establish a ceiling for expenditures. May I remind my colleagues that the U.S. Government is still—after two decades—sending billions of dollars abroad under the foreign aid program? I do not think that one should be accused of overdramatizing if he were to ask how many of those nations are sending troops to battle the forces of communism that our foreign aid program is supposedly helping to resist. But I can tell you that any number of families helping to be kept alive and healthy under the food-stamp program has sons and relatives out there on the front lines of Vietnam or in training and waiting for the next call.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this would be an extremely poor time to make any changes in the food stamp program.

The letters mentioned above follow:

COMMISSIONERS' OFFICE,
ARMSTRONG COUNTY,
Kittanning, Pa., May 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have had the Food Stamp Program in effect in Armstrong County since February, 1967. As Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners, I wish to go on record as being very much in favor of this Program over the Surplus Food Commodity Program that was formerly used in this County.

We have had good response in Armstrong County to the Food Stamp Program and I would like to see it continue.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH J. GEORGE,
Chairman,
Armstrong County Commissioners.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
CLARION COUNTY,
Clarion, Pa., June 2, 1967.

Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: We in Clarion County appreciate the support you are giving the Food Stamp Program. Please do continue to support this program, as we feel it is far superior over the surplus foods, which we originally had to give out to needy families.

The main reasons being that with the Food Stamps, persons can buy what they can and will use for their families.

We feel the Food Stamp Program has been a very valuable asset to Clarion County Needy Residents.

Very truly yours,

CLARION COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.
C. H. BELCHNER, Jr., *Chief Clerk.*

INDIANA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Indiana, Pa., April 26, 1967.

Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: We, the Indiana County Commissioners, are deeply concerned over the possibility of a cutback or the discontinuance of the food stamp program.

Of all the Federally aided welfare programs operated in Indiana County, we feel that the food stamp program has been the most successful and beneficial. This program has not only aided the poverty stricken; the food merchants have likewise been helped.

If the food stamp program is discontinued and the commodity program is reinstated, we feel that an orderly process will only evolve into chaos. The administrative problems in storing and distributing surplus commodities in a management nightmare.

We urge you to support the existing food stamp program and to oppose any changes now under consideration. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

INDIANA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.
FRANK M. BARKLEY.
WILLIAM W. JONES, Sr.
PATRICK J. STAPLETON, Jr.

THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
JFEFERSON COUNTY, PA.,
Brookville, Pa., May 26, 1967.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is to advise you the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners are very much pleased with the way the Food Stamp Program is working out in Jefferson County.

We hope that through your efforts it will continue.

Very truly yours,

FRANK A. REED,
SILAS A. WEAVER,
Jefferson County Commissioners.

CAMBRIA COUNTY BOARD OF ASSISTANCE,
Johnstown, Pa., May 22, 1967.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: I have your request for my comments concerning the merits of the Food Stamp Plan.

To my mind, it is almost a perfect plan and should be continued. It is relatively inex-

pensive for the federal government when we consider the total financial cycle of the plan.

First, the participants pay for the major portion of the stamps they receive. Secondly, the bonus stamps given to the participants are used with the various approved retailers. This increases their income and profits which increases their tax payment back to the federal government. This same circumstance applies through the total process from the retailer, to the wholesaler, to the processor, and to the farmer. All benefit from the use of the stamps and each as a result pays more taxes to the federal government, reducing the net cost of the plan for the federal government. Transportation facilities such as trucking, railroads, and water transportation are also involved in the benefits of the Plan and results in increased tax payments by them to the federal government.

The cost of the plan versus the Surplus Food Distribution plan is less expensive because existing facilities and experienced personnel in commerce, finance, and business are utilized. Government is neither duplicating nor competing with existing institutions and personnel.

Waste is eliminated in the Food Stamp Plan. Participants buy in amounts commensurate with their needs and according to their taste preference. Consequently, the diet of the people is improved because they have what they like to eat and it is fresh. The benefits of an improved diet must be dissertated by others—I believe it.

We must consider too that in our society the government is established for the commonweal of its people; and, this includes the dignity with which it provides for its people. The Food Stamp Plan is a dignified and respectful procedure.

I want to say again that all benefit from the Food Stamp Plan, including the federal government. The latter benefits in that the gross cost is reduced through increased tax returns.

May I take this opportunity to suggest that if there is still a provision in the bill to transfer a part of the cost of the Plan to the States that this provision be eliminated. Basically, the Food Stamp Plan is an effort to help the farmer through an improved diet for people. This is good; it is a sound approach. However, to help the farmer is a federal plan. A state should not be required or even expected to absorb any cost for a strictly federal plan. The states have accepted the costs of making the benefits of the plan available to its people. For example, Pennsylvania provides an experienced staff to measure applicants' eligibility to participate in the Plan; I think they pay the banks a fee for receiving and processing the "stamps" back to the Federal Reserve Bank system; and certain other incidental costs too.

These are proper charges on the State. In my opinion though it is not a proper charge on the State to be charged for a part of the cost of the bonus stamps, which is strictly a plan for moving farmers' surplus crops.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. GOLOB,
Executive Director.

Mr. Chairman, the National Grange has also taken a position on this important legislation and I place the letter received from its legislative representative at this point in my remarks:

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1967.

Re Food Stamp Plan and 20-percent matching provision.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Food Stamp Bill, originally passed as a part of the Wheat-Cotton Bill of 1964, has proven to be a highly acceptable substitute for the old surplus food delivery program, which is no longer usable because of the unavailability of surplus foods for disposal, except for cereals.

According to the Congressional Quarterly, there are 249 Congressional Districts which at present have a Food Stamp Program. Another 92 programs have been requested, some of them in the districts already having a Food Stamp Plan in effect.

It is interesting to note that of the 92 districts with requests pending, 50 of them are represented by Democrats and 42 by Republicans, indicating that this is certainly a nonpartisan problem.

In the Grange testimony before the Agricultural Committee, we gave enthusiastic endorsement to the Plan, but were both surprised and dismayed at the provision to make the bill conditional upon a 20 percent matching of the costs by the states. We believe that the inclusion of the matching fund places an unnecessarily heavy burden on the several states. Not only would it forestall the expansion of the Plan, but it would probably force the abandonment of the Plan in the very states where it is most needed. The enclosed table indicates what this amednment would cost your state, if the matching provision is included.

We do not believe that the Food Stamp Program should operate at the exclusion of welfare programs. However, we do believe that those who are able to pay a part of their basic food needs should do so. The Food Stamp Program has brought the procurement of food into the regular market channels where the recipients have access to the same food available to others in our society. The dual results of upgrading the diets by making essential food available, and the normalizing of the market system for food distribution are commendable and worthwhile objectives.

We urge your support for the continuation of the Food Stamp Program when this bill is presented on the floor of the House, minus the 20 percent matching provision.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY L. GRAHAM.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get an agreement as to the amount of time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the extension and expansion of the food stamp program. I am, however, unalterably opposed to the committee amendment that would require States to match 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons.

I have followed the course of the food stamp program very closely since the city of Cleveland and all of Cuyahoga County joined the pilot test of the food stamp program in May of 1963. Cuyahoga County, together with Lucas County, were two of the 43 pilot areas in which the program was tested between 1961 and 1964.

Ohio now has 34 counties participating in the food stamp program. In April, some 189,000 needy people in Ohio were benefiting from the program. Their food purchasing power was being increased by $1,200,000 a month.

These 189,000 people were getting more meat, more milk, more fruits and vegetables. And they were doing this on a self-help basis. These people were investing some $2,300,000 of their own money in purchased coupons each month—in order to receive the additional $1,200,000 in free coupons.

But, the benefits of the program extend beyond the direct food help to the needy. Retail food sales increase as the families spend the extra $1,200,000 in grocery stores each month—with the benefits of larger markets flowing back to the farmer through the commercial marketing system.

These increased retail sales act as an economic stimulus to the local economy. After the program was in operation for a year in Cuyahoga County, the president of the county board of commissioners stated:

> This [food stamp] program has contributed greatly to the economic growth of the entire community.

He also stated that the value of the bonus or free coupons was equal to the annual payroll of an industry employing several hundred workers.

The success of the food stamp program in Cuyahoga County—and in Ohio—has been repeated in area after area and State after State.

In the light of this success story, I want my colleagues fully to understand the real implications of the committee amendment to require States to match 20 percent of the cost of the free coupons. Its real purpose and its real impact have become clouded behind such justifications as the "need for more State control" or the "protection against program abuses" or "States will administer the program better if their own funds are involved."

First, let us review those issues—I believe that a review of the record will find such arguments without merit. Second, let us realistically look at the impact of the 20 percent matching requirement. That look will conclusively demonstrate that 20 percent matching provision will kill the food stamp program.

What about State control?

No one in the State of Ohio—from Governor Rhodes down to the local government and welfare officials—has raised the question of unwarranted Federal interference. On the contrary, they have made known their concerns that the 20 percent matching provision will put the program beyond the reach of the State and its needy people.

Why have not the States raised the question? Because they now exercise control.

The State must request the program. The Department of Agriculture cannot put one single food stamp program in operation unless the State formally requests it to do so. The State sets the eligibility standards; the local offices of the State welfare agency qualifies each individual family. The States and localities decide when, how, and where the coupons are to be issued.

What about the prevention of program abuses?

I answer that argument with another question: What abuses? The committee itself, in reporting out the bill, took the trouble to commend the Department of Agriculture on the care with which the program had been planned and carried out in the past 3 years. Member after

member stood up during the course of general debate and praised the program as one of the best administered Federal programs now in operation.

What about the argument that States will administer the program better if their own funds are involved?

The answer to that argument is that State funds are now involved. They now pay the costs of intrastate administration—costs that run to about 7 percent of the Federal subsidy.

Second, the Congress wisely provided in section 10(g) of the Food Stamp Act that States shall be financially liable to the Federal Government if there has been gross negligence or fraud on the part of States in the certification of applicant households. So, both States' funds and specific State financial liability for poor administration are guaranteed without a 20-percent matching amendment.

Now, having disposed of the red herrings developed by the supporters of the 20-percent matching provision, let us look at the impact of that proposal.

A look at its impact reveals that it can have but one result. It will kill the program as effectively as if the Congress fails to provide any authority. A vote for the 20-percent matching amendment is in effect a vote against the continuation of the food stamp program.

States are now sorely pressed to find revenues to support their own public assistance programs. If they cannot raise the funds to meet the basic needs of welfare recipients, then how can we expect that they can—or would—raise the funds to help pay the cost of the stamp program that is directed only to the food needs of low-income people?

There was no discussion of this State matching proposal during the course of the hearings on H.R. 1318. I have carefully read the testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry where this State matching provision was discussed. Witnesses before that committee uniformly testified that the States said that the maching requirement would force them to withdraw from the food stamp program.

Ohio will have to withdraw. There is now a proposal before the State legislature to raise welfare payments for aid to dependent children—an increase that is sorely needed because grants to ADC families are now only about 70 percent of what the State itself says is an acceptable minimum amount. Ohio's financial position is such that even this proposal contemplates that the counties would have to finance 50 percent of the added cost. And, it is clear that many counties could not raise their proposed share of the added cost.

Under the proposed 20-percent matching amendment, Ohio would need to put up nearly $7,000,000 a year in order to bring the benefits of the food stamp program to its low-income people. It will not be able to do so.

Federal requirement for State matching—contrary to the contentions of the proponents of the matching provision—does not guarantee State matching, because most, if not all, States simply cannot find extra money in already tightly stretched budgets to meet such a new demand. Some States—particularly the lower income States—are still not taking advantage of all of the Federal public assistance funds available to them because they have not been able to raise the required State matching funds. They have had to forego the full benefits of Federal aid just as they will have to forego the benefits of the food stamp program.

It has been suggested that the States could require county or local governments to bear the 20-percent cost. This is untenable. It would mean that the communities most in need of the food stamp program would be the least able to raise the required tax funds.

Finally, the States would be forced to return to the less desirable surplus commodity donation program, because the States would not have to match the cost of those donated foods.

No advocate of 20 percent matching for the food stamp program proposes that the States should be required to pay 20 percent of the Federal cost of the donated commodities that would be provided to needy families in lieu of food stamps.

I think it becomes clear that advocates of the 20-percent matching would end the food stamp program, by pricing it out of reach of the States. They want to force the surplus commodity donation program on the States, although their reasons for doing so are hard to understand.

I urge my colleagues to stand up and be counted for a well-administered, effective program that brings our abundance of food within the reach of our needy—whether they reside in cities such as Cleveland or in farming areas in the Mississippi delta counties in the South. You will be for the food stamp program only if you vote against the 20-percent matching amendment.

(Mr. RONAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my wholehearted support of the Sullivan food stamp program. Although the present bill under consideration bears the name of the gentlewoman from Missouri, the House Agriculture Committee has added an objectionable provision which would require the participating States to pay for 20 percent of the program. I join with Mrs. SULLIVAN in her move to strike this provision from the bill so that the program may continue as originally authorized. I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mrs. SULLIVAN is to be commended for her pioneering in this field. Her efforts and those of the Department of Agriculture have produced an outstanding program—one which induces self-reliance and in no sense can it be branded a "give away." She feels that the 20-percent provision would seriously endanger the program in many States and this holds true for my own State, the State of Illinois.

In Illinois 20 percent would amount to $2,147,957 at the present level of operation. In Cook County alone the local participation would be $1,056,895. Illinois, like all States, already has its budget problems and could not, according to Governor Kerner, divert over $2,000,000 for other urgent items of need under our public aid program to assume its portion of the cost. Already, Illinois is spending something over $1 million a year in State moneys for operating expenses of the stamp plan.

Governor Kerner has stated that the adoption of the 20-percent provision would "compel the State of Illinois to two alternatives, both undesirable: (1) withdrawal from the Stamp Plan or (2) lowering of our food standard to accommodate for the monies diverted to paying the proposed 20 percent of bonus Stamp Costs."

The program has been operating in Cook County since April 1, 1965, and has been expanded to include 67 counties in Illinois since that date. Attesting to the success of the program in the Chicago area are stories which appeared in the Chicago Tribune and the New World.

Under date of July 11, 1965, the Chicago Tribune carried a story with a headline reading "Food Stamp Program Catches On, 30,641 Families Participated"—"Bonus Plan Helps Poor Beef Up Their Diets." The reporter wrote:

> From the vantage point of families using the stamps, the program is a menu brightener and a boon, despite some complexities and a bit of confusion. Many said they were eating better food, with the emphasis on more and better quality meats, fruits and vegetables, since they joined the program.
>
> Some of the results cited are:
>
> Ten children of a near northwest side mother are now drinking fresh milk.
>
> A middle-aged couple treated themselves to oranges, grapefruit and bananas.
>
> A mother of two served her teenagers roast beef, a noveity on their table.

The New World on June 25, 1965, carried a story with the banner headline "Food Stamp Program Aids Needy Families by Increasing Their Purchasing Power" which cited the help which was being given in the Chicago area to low-income and welfare-supported families which could not afford otherwise to obtain the food they need.

The Food Mart News of Chicago on July 1, 1965, carried a story under the headline "Food Stamps Increase in Popularity" which discussed at some length the successful operation ofthe program.

But, unfortunately, the food stamp program in Illinois is in jeopardy. A requirement of 20-percent financial participation by the States, which is contained in legislation to extend the program as reported by the House Agriculture Committee, would in all likelihood sound the death knell for the program in quirement of 20-percent financial partion requirement should be amended out of the bill and I urge my colleagues to support and adopt the bill as originally introduced by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think there is no question but what, if this amendment is adopted, it will kill the program. I happen to represent a State which is considered to be quite wealthy, but my own States has already indicated they will probably drop this program if the 20-percent requirement is added to the

bill. So I think your vote on this amendment determines whether you are for the program or against the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois yielded his time to Mr. ANNUNZIO.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that when the Congress, in its wisdom, develops and enacts a program which works in the manner in which we had intended—without scandal or abuse or blundering administration—we should all rejoice and take pride in our work.

Instead, there are voices here telling us the program we enacted in 1964 to provide adequate nutritional standards for low-income families works so well we now cannot afford it any longer.

These are the same voices which told us 3 years ago it would not work at all. Southern Illinois was selected as a pilot area to test the program and it has worked very well.

Some of the Members on the other side who fought the program so hard in 1964 say they are ready to support it now if we just mess it up a little and adopt their amendments to cripple it. They say they are for it now—but.

Others, of course, say they are not for it and never were—and at least they are consistent.

But I do not believe the opposition party has anything in the way of suggestions today to make this program work better than it has been working. No one on the other side has proposed relaxing the purchase requirements so that people who now find it difficult to scrape together the money they must pay for the food stamps can get them at less cost. No one on the other side has urged an increase in the food allotments to match increases in the cost of living.

They have not proposed anything to widen the scope or improve the effectiveness of the program in its primary purpose—which is getting enough of the right food to people who cannot afford to eat properly without some help.

This program is not perfect, by any means. But it works. It does what we intended it to do. It does it efficiently and effectively. It helps people eat properly—old people who otherwise would skimp on food and use their little bit of money for other things. Do not let the enemies of this program kill it, Mr. Chairman. It is one the Democratic Party can be proud of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Committee on Agriculture, I take great pride in the fact that I played a role, however small, in the enactment of the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

The food stamp program has been a highly important and most effective means of providing a more equitable share of our food abundance to low-income families throughout the Nation.

The program was started late in fiscal year 1961 on a pilot basis to test the effectiveness of this approach. The success of the pilot operations led to enactment of the Food Stamp Act of 1964. Special evaluation studies clearly show that the program has been achieving is goals. The bill which is again before us, H.R. 1318, amends the 1964 act to extend it for 1 year. The committee amendment to the bill further amends the act by providing that beginning July 1, 1969, each participating State or political subdivision thereof will pay 20 percent of the cost of free—bonus—stamps distributed to eligible households. Under the program as currently operated, the Federal Government is responsible for the total cost of the bonus coupons issued to needy families.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the extension of the food stamp program. However, I just as strongly oppose the committee amendment to shift 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons to the participating States. This amendment should be defeated.

If this change is made in the program, many of the States now participating will likely end their participation in the program.

Many of the States now participating in the program continue to have serious difficulty providing sufficient funds to support their own public welfare programs. Some States—particularly the lower income States—are not now taking full advantage of available Federal public assistance programs because they have not been able to raise the matching funds required. This amendment would limit still further their ability to assist their needy families.

Mr. Chairman, our welfare programs, be they State-sponsored or Federal-sponsored, must continue to provide for the pressing needs of poor families, including a better nutrition through increased food consumption, if we are to merit the recognition of an affluent democracy. The States' welfare programs must provide for the needs of all their needy families, and State resources must be effectively allocated to achieve that objective in order to achieve any degree of success. If the several States were able to finance such a public assistance program, it would not be necessary to continue the food stamp program.

As the program now operates, it is not without cost to the participating States. Many purchasers of food stamps use welfare money received from the States, in the first instance. States or the local areas also finance the costs of the program administration. The Department of Agriculture estimates that these administrative costs amount to about 7 percent of the value of the bonus coupons. To add 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons to these costs would price the program out of reach of those States in which the program is most needed.

Estimates indicate that, if this cost sharing amendment is adopted, the total financial burden to the States participating in the food stamp program in fiscal year 1970 would be increased by $64 million. In my own State of Hawaii this increase would amount to at least $100,000.

Mr. Chairman, the committee amendment providing for cost sharing by the participating States would in effect defeat the very purpose for which the food stamp program was established. It would deprive the areas in greatest need of the benefits of the program. If we can agree that the food stamp program has worked, and I believe we can readily so agree, then we can certainly agree that any crippling amendment such as this should go down in resounding defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ARENDS yielded his time to Mr. GOODLING.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of this House, yesterday we saw in this House a red flag raised against irresponsible Federal spending. This was the voice of the people of the United States speaking. For the next few weeks we will probably be seeing Members with arms in slings.

But, be that as it may, if this bill and this amendment is defeated—and all of us have heard over and over again certain dire consequences as a result of the adoption of this amendment, if this 20 percent is not retained the States will not be able to bear this additional burden.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us be realistic and face facts.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union what I said in connection with this matter just recently. I assume you will agree Ohio and Pennsylvania are two of the poorer States, yet they receive the greatest amount under this bill.

Let me also remind you that at a time when our economy is at an all-time high, our unemployment at an all-time low, we are expanding a welfare program.

A vote for this committee amendment is a vote for some sense of fiscal responsibility at the Federal level.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ECKHARDT].

(Mr. ECKHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, in my State of Texas there are 10 counties which utilize the food stamp program. This constitutes only about 4 percent of the State's counties. However, it represents a significant number of people, now about 11,000 persons, who need the added nutrition provided by this most desirable program. If the committee amendment is adopted this 4 percent of the Texas counties will have to convince the majority, including 96 percent of the counties which are not affected, to support a State legislative appropriation. If they cannot do so, they are denied the choice they now have to use the food stamp program rather than the surplus commodity program. I am against the committee amendment because it would deny the local self-determination that now exists

and permit the State to dictate uniformity in an area in which there is much diversity amongst the counties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SCHERLE yielded his time to Mr. BELCHER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

(Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, the first food stamp program was inaugurated and placed into effect in McDowell county of the congressional district which it is my honor to represent, the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, based upon my experience with this program, I can assure the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the food stamp program represents persistent work and diligence, and is an investment in the future of America and we must keep and maintain it.

(Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARRETT yielded his time to Mrs. SULLIVAN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to remind the Committee that at no time during the debate on this bill has any question been made as to the efficiency and honesty of the administration of this program.

What this money does is to provide increased nutritious food and better diets for American families. That is the best possible investment that can be made with Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TEAGUE of California yielded his time to Mr. BELCHER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point out that in no Federal welfare program does the Federal Government pay 100 percent of the costs. In the old-age assistance program, for example, it is paying 65.6 percent. In the aid to families with dependent children it is paying 56 percent. Aid to the blind program, it is paying 55.7 percent. Aid to the permanently and totally disabled, it is paying 64.7 percent. And in the medical programs it is paying 53.5 percent.

Beginning in July 1968, States and local governments will pay 20 percent of the costs of some of the poverty programs. So I believe the committee amendment is entirely consistent with the other ongoing programs of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN.]

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this program is to insure that the poor people of this country are not denied minimal nutritional needs. The food stamp program, as originally envisioned by our distinguished colleague, the gentlelady from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], provided a creative means of increasing food consumption among indigent citizens, while aiding the agricultural economy and helping local retailers.

In 1964, when this program was first approved, an attempt was made to require the States to pay 50 percent of its costs. This was rejected, because in practice, it would have fallen upon those very areas least able to afford the costs. The States are currently paying about 45 percent of the administrative costs. An increase in this budren, even to 20 percent of the entire program would effectively cripple it, for the same reasons it would have in 1964.

I urge the defeat of the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO].

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment, and I commend the gentlewoman from Missouri for her years of hard work on behalf of the needy and hungry people of America.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment to require the States to pay a greatly increased share of the cost of the food stamp program. I am not going to take very much time, because I expressed my views during the general debate on this bill on May 15. I believe very strongly in this program, pioneered by my chairman on the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. We are talking about food for the stomachs of hungry people—or people who would be hungry if this program were not allowed to continue in the manner in which it has been operating so well.

How can we make such an issue out of the comparatively few dollars we spend on the food stamp program compared to the billions of dollars worth of food we give away all over the world? I cannot understand that kind of reasoning. This program and the attacks being made upon it. Is a dollar more important than a child's eating a proper meal? I cannot understand that kind of reasoning. This is not a program where we are spending billions of dollars. For about two million people, we are spending something like $160 million at current levels of operation of the food stamp program. This is the difference between going without proper food and having a minimum adequate diet. You would think we were giving Fort Knox away.

Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing that has characterized the United States of America for the past generation, it has been a willingness to help the people of other countries to improve their standard of living and their opportunity to pursue a good life for their people in freedom. We helped Greece and Turkey to stay free; we spent billions upon billions of dollars under the Marshall plan and other programs to aid other nations. Some begrudge the money we have spent to try to achieve a better world.

Our generosity has often brought us ingratitude, and worse. But we have persisted because we felt freedom was worth preserving—that we could not keep ours unless every nation had a chance to achieve freedom, too.

We are now spending nearly a billion dollars a year to add a tiny bit of additional nourishment to the starving people of India. Our wheat farmers benefit from this, of course, but our motives are better than that. We give this food away. We have given away untold billions of dollars worth of food all over the globe.

Is it not ironic that some Members rise in great alarm over the fact that in the coming year we will spend somewhere around $200 million—one-fifth of the food aid to India alone—in aiding very low income Americans to enjoy a basic minimum diet? Are we that destitute of the spirit of humanity for our own people?

These are not people getting a handout. They must earmark a certain percentage of their entire income for nothing but food. And if they agree to do that—to buy as much food as they can possibly afford out of their own money—we agree to supplement their food purchasing dollar with an additional 50 cents worth of food, on the average. Those who oppose this plan apparently would rather give that food away abroad, or let it rot in the fields or warehouses. I favor the food stamp program in preference to the breadline.

I absolutely oppose the committee amendment to destroy this program.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want, first, to indicate support for the food stamp program.

A broader food stamp program should be authorized. It has proved itself in the 7½ years it has been operating.

I am, however, opposed to the proposed committee amendment which would require that States and localities finance 20 percent of the cost of the free coupons to be issued. This provision will not strengthen the program as its proponents contend. It will kill it. Those States and localities most in need of a stamp program would not be able to take advantage of it.

Supporters of this State-matching provision support it because they say it is necessary to keep the program from getting "out of hand." But, there are no State-matching requirements for the value of the Federal foods now being provided to States for donation to needy families and this program has not got-

ten out of hand. So, matching funds are not needed to control the stamp program.

Supporters say that matching funds are necessary to protect the States' prerogatives in making major decisions in welfare programs. But, we have no evidence, no complaints from States, that the current food donation program has interfered with their rights or prerogatives. Nor have any of the States in which the food stamp program is now operating, on an unmatched basis, indicated that the Department of Agriculture is interfering with State welfare programs.

The matching provisions of this bill will make the program inoperative and keep it from helping low-income families and U.S. farmers.

Mr. Chairman, the question we are being asked today is not whether the States should share in the cost of this program. They do now. The real question being asked is: "Are we going to price this program out of reach of the States?"

At the present time the intrastate administrative costs borne by the States equal approximately 7 percent of the value of the bonus coupons. To ask the States to furnish 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons, in addition to present costs, is entirely unrealistic. The States have said so.

So, I ask the supporters of the 20-percent matching amendment, are you willing to vote to prevent States from exercising their right to choose between commodity distribution and food stamps?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment is designed to help those States which have always opposed social legislation to kill this program, and to force the indigents from those States into the big cities of our country. We in Chicago have seen a steady migration of indigents from the South simply because many of our southern communities refuse to accept their own responsibility to the poor. Can you imagine the State of Mississippi appropriating 20 percent of State funds for this program? If this amendment is adopted you will see these States kill the program simply by not appropriating their share.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the State of Ohio has received, as I understand it, $18 million from this program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is time that we stand up and be counted. Yes, in our State of Ohio we have received more funds from the food stamp program than any other State, but I support this amendment because I believe firmly that we must pay our share at the State level.

I know our Governor of Ohio has asked us not to support the amendment, and I can understand his reason for asking this. However, I favor it because I feel we should support these programs at the State level.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We have prepared legieslation here in the legislative hoppers that would force States and various localities, as a matter of fact, into sharing. Numerous bills are in the hopper to share revenues, and now we suggest that the revenues we are supposed to share shall be taken away from the State.

Where is the logic to that?

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is neither the time nor the circumstance under which we should be currently considering this amendment to provide for State contribution for the food stamp program. I hope this amendment will be defeated.

In my community, food stamps have kept welfare families alive despite welfare grants which give them only about 78 percent of minimum living costs. Food stamps since 1963 have given the poor a chance to add 25 percent more food to their scanty diets.

Governor James A. Rhodes has warned that if the bill passes with the amendment as it now is, food stamps would probably have to be abolished in Ohio.

At this particular time, all States, including Ohio, are burdened with special needs to implement the medicaid and public welfare programs. It would be most unfortunate to add this overwhelming burden to compel the State to contribute to the food stamp program.

Every month, more than 19,500 families in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County utilize $453,000 in food stamps to supplement their food purchases and their diets.

The poor of my community and the poor of America would have to pay for the economy extorted from their budgets by this devastating amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RANDALL yielded his time to Mrs. SULLIVAN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS.]

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

There has been a lot of discussion here this afternoon about raising the 20 percent in relief rolls of the States.

Who is going to pay this? You and I—the taxpayers of this country.

It is true that it is going to raise the States 20 percent but just yesterday we proved that unless we start curbing this thing and tightening our belt, actually we are going to raise taxes 6 percent for every taxpayer in this country.

I think that notice was served yesterday and now there is an opportunity for every one of us to really and sincerely back up what we did yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, let us look at the arguments that have been presented here.

MAINTAINING STATE RESPONSIBILITY

Let us look at the argument that making the States pay 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons will result in greater responsibility on the part of the States. Is there any evidence that the States have been lax in living up to their responsibilities under this program? There was none in the hearings. I saw no testimony, or heard none, indicating that any State participating in the food stamp program was not carrying out the letter as well as the spirit of the food stamp law.

The States do not now have any key to the Treasury vaults in this program. The standards they adopt for participation must be approved by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and signed in a formal compact of agreement. If anything, the States have been tough in the administration of the program. I found that true in Missouri when St. Louis came into the program. We had a terrific battle with the State welfare department and the Department of Agriculture here in Washington to persuade them to wake up to the facts of life on urban living costs and to amend the regulations so that the people who needed the food stamp program could participate. It was a real battle.

Generally, the same caseworkers who make investigations for welfare also investigate food stamp eligibility. The standards for the various States are given at pages H5421 and H5422 of the RECORD of May 15, when we had general debate on this bill.

The States are now responsible for running the program properly. This is not going to make them more conscientious; this amendment would only make it more difficult, or in many cases impossible, for the States to participate at all.

Was any State official asked to testify on this bill? None appeared. No evidence was spread on the record of the hearings to show that any State is not exercising "prudence" in the operation of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, the thing that I have in my hand is not a recommendation from me and it is not a recommendation for the food stamp plan.

I just want to bring a few facts before you.

I believe that every Governor of every State in this Union feels a responsibility towards the poor people in his State. If this program is such a poor program that

no Governor is willing to pay 1 dollar out of 5 dollars of the cost of it, it certainly is a lousy program in my book. That is to say, a State or Governor who will not pay 20 percent of the cost of this thing because he does not think it is worth as much as 20 percent to his people—and if I had a program in which I could not sell $5 for $1, I would feel that I had a pretty poor program.

Every proponent of this who has come to this well has said, "If you ask our State to pay 20 percent of this, it will be the absolute end of this program." If it is not a better program than that, then we here in the Congress should not buy it either.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it is quite plain that most of those who have discussed this recently have been arguing in favor of the food stamp bill. There is no argument there. You have not heard anybody make a speech against the food stamp bill.

It is merely a practical question of how to get the best administration. The committee tried to be fair about it. We said that we would ask for State participation but that we would put no unreasonable burden on the States. We knew that all of the States would not have a legislature in session sometime within the next 2 years, and we provide that they do not have to make these contributions until the 2 full years have elapsed and until they have had the chance to have their legislature meet and pass a bill and appropriate the money.

Had there been any spirit or any desire to destroy this program, our committee would not have been so considerate.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I feel it is incumbent upon us to eliminate the requirement of this legislation that States be required to participate in the program in the future by providing 20 percent in participating funds. This program seems to be working effectively in the areas of greatest need in our Nation today. The States simply do not have the necessary funds that are required of them in the event this amendment is adopted. If we mean for this program to work and to give an opportunity to a number of unfortunate families in America today to receive adequate and necessary foodstuffs in the local marketplace, then this amendment must be defeated.

I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, will not support the amendment and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. SULLIVAN and Mr. BELCHER.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 141, noes 120.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: Add the following new section at the end of the bill:

"SEC. 3. Section 5 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) The Secretary shall issue regulations providing that—

"'(1) families with very low money incomes may not be excluded from the program by minimum stamp purchase requirements which exceed their budgetary resources.

"'(2) sliding scales, lower than minimum purchase requirements in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection, be established for families with very low money incomes.

"'(3) families with very low money incomes may not be required to commit themselves to purchase stamps every month as a condition of participation in the program.'"

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], reserves a point of order against the amendment.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the food stamp program, a creative mechanism to expand purchases of food by our poorest citizens, is based on the premise that everyone should make some minimal expenditure for food, and the further premise that, if this purchasing power can be expanded through stamps, the poor family, the local grocer, and the farmer will all benefit.

However, ample evidence suggests that in the poorest areas, where people are heavily in debt or entirely outside a money economy, some citizens are unable to pay even the current minimum required to participate.

When we are told in the words of the title of a disturbing article in the New York Times magazine of June 4, 1967, by Robert Sherrill "It's Not True That Nobody Starves in America," our first reaction is that this cannot be so. I quote from the testimony of the distinguished civil rights leader, A. Philip Randolph, before the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty:

> Government administrators seem not to understand that the poorest people simply don't have money.

Dr. George Wiley, director of the Poverty Rights Action Center, in his testimony to the House Committee on Agriculture on March 15 of this year, stated:

> The most fundamental and universal complaint of food stamp recipients is that they are forced to commit a major portion of their already inadequate budgets to the purchase of food stamps. Most recipients feel that the amount they must tie up in food stamps is more than they can afford to spend on food and still meet the other needs of their families. In addition, restricting the use of a sizeable portion of a meager budget greatly increase financial hardship.

When legislators learn that intended recipients do not always benefit in spite of the existence of this worthwhile program, the reaction may be to rail at the ingratitude, or we hear the response that the food stamp program was not meant as a welfare program in the first place, and that people so poor they cannot even afford the stamps are, or should probably be, on charity in any event.

I do not propose in my amendment to alter any functions of the food stamp program. My amendment, which is now before the Committee simply directs the Secretary of Agriculture to use his existing authority to remove those impediments which are preventing the most needy people from participating in this program.

The Secretary presently approves the administrative regulations of each State.

In Mississippi, where the minimum monthly stamp purchase requirement is $2 per person, a poor family of six must put up $12 monthly if it wishes to participate. For a sharecropper with a total cash income of perhaps $20 a month or less, this requirement might just as well be $1,200.

If a family has debts, as so many have, it is often unwilling or unable to commit 50 percent or more of its income to stamps even if the stamps would be of great benefit to it.

My amendment also goes to a certain administrative inflexibility in the existing program. In the program as it now operates, there is a general requirement that participants commit themselves to buy a certain amount of stamps each month in order to qualify. This procedure acts as a deterrent to those whose meager incomes are irregular and fluctuating.

Basically, the amendment I have offered will do two things. It will remove the requirement that stamps be bought every month, and it will require the Secretary to lower the minimum so that the poorest people will not be deterred or prevented from participating in this program on either ground.

Furthermore, although the older commodity distribution program is deficient in many respects, at least people did not starve under it. But as localities have switched over to the food stamp program, participation inevitably declines, for the reason I have just cited. Our colleague the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] in her testimony before the Committee on Agriculture noted that after St. Louis changed from commodity distribution to food stamps, participation dropped by 80 percent. And even after an intensive education program, it rose to only half its former level

In New York respresentatives of welfare recipients and poverty groups have objected to the food stamp program, partly for the reasons I cite. One constituent writes:

> The surplus food plan desperately needs to be abolished or revised, however we do not see the stamp plan as the least bit satisfactory as a substitute. This plan makes it impossible for a family to adjust its budget.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider the plight of the poor family when it is confronted with a stamp program which may appear to be a blessing but which is simply beyond the reach of that family.

All my amendment asks is that the Secretary use his existing powers, the powers which he has under the 1964 act,

to make the program available to such individuals and to such families.

There was a very important article which I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, published in the New York Times magazine of last Sunday, June 4, 1967, written by Robert Sherrill, which points up the inherent difficulties in this program and how it does not reach a great many citizens of this country who simply do not have the budgetary resources to allocate $2 per person in each family to the purchase of food stamps.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be adopted. It will make clear the sense of the Congress to the Secretary that the minimums should be reduced to bring more poor people under the food stamp program so that they can benefit from this investment in the nutritional health of our Nation.

I include at this point in the RECORD, Robert Sherrill's article from the New York Times magazine of June 4, 1967:

IT ISN'T TRUE THAT NOBODY STARVES IN AMERICA

(By Robert Sherrill)

(NOTE.—Robert Sherrill is the Washington correspondent for The Nation and author of "The Accidental President.")

Heywood Broun, watching a breadline in 1932, is said to have remarked with cynical sympathy, "Poor people wouldn't be such a bother if they didn't starve so publicly." Since the end of the Depression, and especially in recent years with the development of more sophisticated welfare programs, poor people have been much more discreet about their starving.

Occasionally, the public peace of mind is elbowed by a news story indicating that something may not be quite right—a Mississippi family is reported to have eaten a cat; some Kentucky coal miners are seen eating only potato peelings for lunch; in Washington, D.C., pensioners scramble for discarded lettuce and cabbage leaves behind one of the largest markets. But most poor people are not observed in their ingenuities, and, in any event, the Government lists only 1,279 deaths from "malnutrition" and 197 deaths from "hunger, thirst, and exposure" in 1965, the last year for which there are statistics.

This, coupled with the natural optimism of Americans, has pushed into public faith an almost religious tenet—a second miracle of the loaves and fishes—called Nobody Starves in America, with the alternate title, No Adult Is Completely Broke For Long.

As with most economic dogmas, both are false, yet the foundation heaves a bit when either is challenged. And this may account for the present unease and unhappiness among some high Washington officials as they observe the Senate Anti-Poverty Subcommittee going around the country holding meetings and reviving the political topic of hunger as it has not been revived since the nineteen-thirties. (When, on Senator George Murphy's motion, the subcommittee unanimously asked President Johnson to send emergency food to Mississippi to stop wide starvation, even the Office of Economic Opportunity jumped in to belittle the subcommittee's findings.) With all the powerful antagonisms the tour is arousing, its revival mood would probably not achieve much, except that one of the evangelists on the subcommittee happens to be Senator Robert F. Kennedy, whose disciples fill many a grotto and thrive on opposition.

The problem that a majority of this subcommittee—Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, both Kennedy brothers, Jacob Javits of New York, *et al.*—is attempting to attack is illustrated perfectly in the two charity food programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The older program deals in surplus commodities. The men who put it through Congress never posed as humanitarians—the basic purpose of the commodities program is to support and stabilize farm prices, not support and stabilize needy people. It distributes free food from a larder stocked with whatever the Government's price support program has piled up, and the major items include flour, cornmeal, rice, grits and dry beans.

None of this is expected to supply more than three-fourths of minimum diet requirements. The only meat, when there is any, is a canned variety which the department states in its literature is not expected to provide a family with more than one-seventh of its needs. Each member of the family gets about $5.50 worth of food a month, but the food never includes eggs, citrus fruits, green or yellow vegetables, potatoes, sugars or sweets.

A diet of nothing but "commodities" is guaranteed to produce physical lethargy, mental depression and frequent onslaughts of disease. But, after all, this is called a supplemental program, and the optimistic Agriculture Department assumes that there is other food in the house to be supplemented. As for the quality of the commodities, that is debated. I attended a welfare rights conference at which the delegate from New York City said the commodities are "not fit for pigs." This came as something of a surprise to the delegate from Mississippi, who pointed out that in those relatively few parts of the South which have permitted this Federal program to operate, thousands of Negroes live on nothing else.

The other Federal anti-hunger program run by the Agriculture Department is food stamps.

Enaction of this program was the first thing President Kennedy did in the White House. Today 41 states participate to varying degrees; all major cities are in it except New York and Boston, and New York may join if pending Congressional legislation increases its funds.

Theoretically, it is a gorgeous program, constructed around the notion that everybody spends something for food each month, but poor people just don't spend enough. Solution: Allow the poor people to pay the Department of Agriculture what they would ordinarily spend for food, and in return give them bonus stamps which are just as good as money for buying any U.S.-produced food in the stores. A scale had to be worked out arbitrarily to decide what people "ordinarily" spend, but the department had no trouble settling on a scale starting at $2 a head, with a maximum payment of $12 a month for the largest family with the lowest income. In exchange for the $12, the family would get $70 worth of tickets.

The assumption is that any adult breadwinner can manage to raise $2 for each member of his family once a month. For Congressman Jamie Whitten of Mississippi, chairman of the House Subcommittee for Agriculture Appropriations, this is more than an assumption; it is a certainty. Whitten is a powerful man in agriculture. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman sometimes says, "I have two bosses. One is President Johnson. The other is Jamie Whitten." So when Freeman wants to clear something important, he takes it to Whitten.

Recently he went to Whitten for a private consultation on the idea of lowering the food stamp prices, maybe to 50 cents for people with no income. After all, there was a lot of rumbling in Mississippi. There were rumors, even, that some Negroes were so desperate they were contemplating breaking into Government warehouses. Well, what did Whitten think about it? "Nonsense," said Whitten. "There's nobody in Mississippi who can't raise $2 a month. If there is, just bring me a list of them and we'll take care of them." Freeman left the proposal at that.

If he ever gets around to making up the list—which should be about the longest noncensus list in history—Miss Marian Wright, Jackson attorney for the N.A.A.C.P., will be glad to give him her file of several hundred sworn paupers. Gene Roberts, head of The New York Times bureau in Atlanta, can probably add plenty of names. He recently wrote of one Locket Mayze, 59, who said "he could not remember when he last had a dollar in his pocket or when—with the exception of a hog's head given him by a friend—his wife and eight children had eaten anything other than surplus farm commodities." A couple of weeks ago Jim Hyatt told, in The Wall Street Journal, of meeting Richard Bogen, 62-year-old Negro farmhand, in an Arkansas plantation store, where he sat "with cap in hand and tears filling his eyes" because "Right now I've got just 2 pennies in my pocket." These people may be invisible to politicians, but any reporter who covers the South is constantly running into the Mayzes and the Bogens.

"Government administrators seem not to understand," Negro leader A. Philip Randolph told the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, "that the poorest people simply don't have money." The South is thick with Negroes who live in a primitive world of barter. They work or they don't work, but when they do work it is for past debts or to establish future credit. No money changes hands. They wear cast-off clothes, they eat charity food. They buy nothing. The sharecroppers wound up the season last October either in debt to their landlords or coming out of the cotton year with, say, $50—which promptly went to pay debts in town. Their pockets have been empty for six or seven months, at least. To them, $2 a head—or even 50 cents a head—for the stamp program might as well be $2,000 a head. They simply can't raise it. If they could raise it, it would only be by borrowing from their landlords, who charge up to 50 per cent interest.

The best proof of the nonexistence of money in some areas lies in the Agriculture Department's own file cabinets, where records show that in eight Mississippi counties that changed over from commodities to food stamps (the department won't permit both programs to operate in the same county because, with its usual optimism, it assumes a family getting cheap food doesn't need additional free food) the list of participants fell off by 21,000—which can be presumed to be the number who did not have the money to stay in.

Although these two programs at present are social booby traps, with relatively minor adjustments they could be perfected and with even fewer changes could be spread. Agriculture officials concede that in the South there are 17.5 million people in poverty (nearly half the nation's total) but only two million are receiving Federal food.

Of the 283 poorest counties in 15 Southern and border states, 93 counties—the home of three million people considered poor by O.E.O. standards—have no form of food distribution whatever. In the other 190 counties live 7,100,367 poor people, but only 1,029,331 get food aid. There are several reasons the other six million may have been excluded: maybe they can't afford to pay for the stamps; maybe the commodities distribution center is too far from their home; maybe local welfare workers have not bothered to tell them about the programs or welfare officials have refused to qualify them for help. In some states it isn't easy to qualify. Department of Agriculture officials acknowledge, for example, that if a four-person family in South Carolina earns more than $1,400 a year it cannot qualify for the stamp program (the only aid available), although the

O.E.O. rates nonfarm families of four as poor if they don't earn more than $2,250 a year.

Hard times aren't limited to the back country. Of the 310,000 persons living in Mobile County, Alabama, 99,000 are judged poor by Federal standards. None has access to either commodities or food stamps. Of the 67,000 poor in Pulaski County (Little Rock), Arkansas, only 3,483 get Federal food. In Harris County, Texas, location of the South's largest city, Houston, there are a quarter of a million poor people but only 20,000 get food aid, and only the commodities.

Unquestionably it is easier, however, to exist in the urban clumps. The odd job is easier to come by. Proximity helps—it is more convenient to send the children to a neighbor's table, or to borrow a dollar from a relative whose welfare check hasn't been held up. It is easier to wangle an Aid to Dependent Children check in urban counties because hunger is unsightly and the cities are more sensitive to esthetics these days.

The family living in the shanty on the "back 40" of the old plantation is out of sight, out of the county officials' minds, and therefore usually out of luck. In this respect, the forces squeezing the blacks out of the rural South and into the Northern cities may be nutritionally beneficial. The squeezing forces are fourfold: there's a cotton cutback in some areas; mechanization of many jobs is almost total; weed-killing chemicals are eliminating the need for a human being on the end of a hoe; and the $1-an-hour minimum wage that went into effect this year is re-hardening many a planter's heart. The same people who were considered "good ol' darkies" a few years ago are now considered deadwood, hardly worth keeping alive.

Nowhere are the faults and the promises of the Government's food distribution program seen better than in Mississippi, which has one of the most complete programs in America. Every county in the state participates in some form of Federal asistance, which is rare not merely by Southern standards but by national standards. Nowhere else in the Bible Belt are poor folks given anything like a comparable amount of assistance.

One-fourth of all Mississippians (about 470,000) are eating federally paid-for food, more even than New York's charity food population (440,000). The food comes via Washington, but at least Mississippi lets it in. By comparison, South Carolina won't let the commodities program into the state at all and permits the stamp program to operate in only 10 of 46 counties; in only three of the 20 poorest counties are the stamps sold, and on such a tight basis that only 10,900 of the 715,000 poor in these counties are assisted. Virginia has food programs for only 1.9 per cent of its impoverished people; Texas covers only 5.6 per cent; Louisiana, 7.9 per cent. In the Deep South no state but Mississippi allows more than 10.9 per cent of its poor people to participate in food programs—and Mississippi offers them to 42.3 per cent.

Yet Mississippi is a laboratory of hunger and of Federal fumbling. On the Delta—that northwestern bulge of the state that arches along the river from Memphis to Vicksburg—one can stand on a steaming summer day and be persuaded that God created the world simply to give Adam a cotton allotment. There is big money here. Delta plantation owners will take out of the soil more than a quarter of a billion dollars this year, most of it in tax-supported crops. In the same area, because of newly mechanized farming techniques, Government officials estimate there wil be between 60,000 and 100,000 unemployed hands by this summer. And, since Mississippi has no general state or local welfare programs, these people must depend on Federal largesse.

Choose any shanty; only the number of bodies inside will vary. Here is a mother and six children, residents of Washington County, against the river. Four of the children are asleep on the floor. They sleep most of the day as well as all night. Their lips and legs are covered with scabs and open sores. The youngest has a distended stomach and from it the umbilical knot sticks out like a valve from an innertube. Some days they eat nothing. Most days they have one meal, of cornmeal. Washington County quit the commodities program in March and went on food stamps. Leftover commodities are all this family has. Now, it is after 2 P.M. and they have eaten nothing, but the mother says she will cook "a little something" later on. She points to a bag on the floor by the stove; a couple of inches of meal are left of what has lasted them two weeks. When she runs out of cornmeal, she will borrow something from a neighbor. Yes, she nods, the neighbors are in bad shape, too. But she will get something.

This must be an extreme case, so drive on, northeast into the Delta's proudest county Sunflower, home of Senator James O. ("Our Jim") Eastland, who operates a 5,800-acre plantation near Ruleville, which is also the home of Sunflower County's next best-known politician, Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, a leader of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic party. Mrs. Hamer used to be a sharecropper, but, like many thousands of others, she was chased off the land. Being well imbedded in the 32-million in this country officially designated as impoverished, Mrs. Hamer speaks empirically: "The main problem about bein' poor is that it only leaves you the choice between not eatin' at all and eatin' so bad you wonder if that is a improvement."

Although reared on a farm and now middle-aged, she has eaten turkey only twice in her life, once a couple of years ago when comedian Dick Gregory shipped a batch of the birds to Mississippi Negroes and the other time when she bought a turkey on the installment plan and paid for it at the rate of 70 cents a week. When the conversation turns to food, Mrs. Hamer will always mention those two turkeys, because otherwise she has nothing to talk about the except the customary meal that gets on her table—meat that is thinly attached to hog neckbones (she broke off a front tooth discovering just how thinly attached). She is a big woman, built out in rings of starch—rice and grits and more grits and flour—held together by bean proteins. Perhaps once a year she eats fruit, but only if a friend who has moved to the relatively luxurious welfare rolls of the North sends it. She cannot afford it herself.

Even the little towns of Mississippi, places like Indianola, county seat of Sunflower, have their slums and they are full of farm hands who no longer have a farm to work on and have come into town to do their starving. I met a boy in Indianola who had had nothing to eat that day but a plate of butterbeans; they day before it had been bread and butterbeans; the day before that, again just butterbeans. Sometimes, he said, it was bread alone. One-course diets are commonplace. Kenneth Dean, executive director of the Mississippi Council on Human Relations who has moved among these people for many months, describes a typical hardship case:

"Breakfast will be grits, molasses and biscuit. For lunch, the adults will eat nothing, and the children who are at home will be given a piece of bread and a drink of Kool-Aid or water. The evening meal usually consists of boiled beans and cornbread." In the worst cases, which are not uncommon, "there is usually no table on which to eat, and what little food there is is eaten by hand out of a bowl or from a newspaper on the floor."

With hunger so abundant and easy to find, it might be anticipated that the Department of Agriculture would react to it in a dramatic fashion. But this has not been the case. Seventeen months ago, Congressman Joseph Resnick, Democrat of New York, made a tour of Mississippi and came back to Washington writing letters to all the appropriate Administration leaders about the "desperation point of . . . . starving Negroes." Nothing happened.

A month later 35 Negroes invaded the abandoned Greenville, Miss., Air Force Base, and before a phalanx of troops was flown in to evict them they distributed leaflets explaining: "We are here because we are hungry and cold and we have no jobs or land." It made the front pages as a protest story, but their appeal for food somehow went astray. Last summer the Department of Agriculture's own Civil Rights Advisory Council held hearings in Jackson, Miss., and made confidential recommendations to Secretary Freeman that he act upon their "deep sense of urgency" that something must be done swiftly "before suffering, hopelessness and frustration make an evolutionary approach extremely difficult and infinitely more expensive, if not—for an interim—impossible." About the same time, across the Mississippi River, Arkansas State Welfare Director A. J. Moss was writing letters to Freeman, warning that thousands of families would soon be unemployed on the Arkansas Delta and that the food situation was critical. Neither warning disquieted the adamant Agriculture Department calm.

Then, in April, the Clark-Kennedy troupe hit Mississippi, accompanied by TV cameramen, journalistic jongleurs and the usual ballyhoo machinery. It made a difference. At this point Freeman began to move cautiously. He dispatched two of his aides—Howard Davis and William Seaborn—to Mississippi for a confidential report. Davis and Seaborn found, of course, what everyone else had been reporting for more than a year: many Mississippians are limp with malnutrition, many cannot afford to buy the food stamps, and some landlords are profiteering off the programs. Among the cases of suffering they cited a man in Winstonville, father of six, who got into the food stamp program only because "a New York A.B.C. newsman on assignment in Mississippi gave him $12 twice to buy food stamps. He does not know what he will do when his present commodities and stamp supplies are gone."

Another case: Mrs. Effie Mae Jackson of Billy May Plantation, mother of five, "has a problem of having the date to buy stamps come prior to receipt of her check from welfare. To meet this she borrows from her landlord the $22 each month, and when her check comes he charges her 50 cents on the dollar, which means she has to pay $33 for the stamps each month." This, plus her $10-a-month rent, means that she must pay $43 for food and rent out of the $55 she gets from welfare.

For some reason, the story Davis and Seaborn brought back penetrated where others had failed. Freeman wrote Senator Clark that he was "deeply concerned about their findings" and that he might change the rules to make persons with no income pay only a fourth as much as at present. He said this before talking with Congressman Whitten. After the latest Whitten conversation, Freeman told Jack Conway, head of the Industrial Union Department of the A.F.L.–C.I.O. and unofficial boss of Walter Reuther's Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, that he isn't going to try to cut the stamps' cost "until the department budget gets out of Whitten's committee."

And that is where reform of the program stands today. It hasn't started.

Civil rights leaders damn Freeman for not opening his ears until two winters had passed since he was first alerted to the predicament of the foodless Southern Negro. But Freeman is not his own man in this dispute. In many respects he is the prisoner of the Southerners who command the agriculture committees and the agriculture ap-

propriations subcommittees in both houses of Congress. As human-support programs, neither the free commodities nor the food stamps are popular with these groups. A bill is now being pushed by some House Southerners that would kill the food stamp program by making it prohibitively costly for many states, particularly those states in Dixie with the highest concentrations of Negroes. Many farm-oriented legislators have a hoary suspicion that any give-away program promotes shiftlessness among the menials.

Nowhere is this attitude better seen than in Alabama, where the distribution of Federal food is made inversely to need, and also inversely to the concentration of Negroes. The 30 richest counties, in the top half of the state, participate in the free-food program; the 37 poorest counties in the bottom do not. Although not notorious for pampering Negroes, the Alabama administration nevertheless encourages the acceptance of Federal surplus foods by the counties because it is a sure-fire way of "beating" Washington. For a very small expense—about one or two cents a day per recipient—the counties receive a cornucopia of food. Montgomery County, for example, would pay about $15,000 a year as the cost of distributing almost $1,000,000 in commodities to its people.

But Montgomery County won't enter the program. Neither will other counties where most of the state's Negroes live. Tallapoosa County, home of the State Welfare Commissioner, refuses to pay the $10,000 required to distribute $700,000 worth of surplus foods. The Negro leaders of Hale County have been trying for two years to get county officials to bring in a food program. First the officials said it was too expensive, but when Washington offered to bear the total cost, they still refused. Agriculture officials refuse to fight this kind of local obstinacy. Secretary Freeman promised a commodities program for Hale last August, but he hasn't delivered it yet.

Could the Federal Government just send the food in anyway, without local approval, and have Federal workers distribute it or let the poor people distribute it themselves? Yes; for 30 years the Secretary of Agriculture has had power to distribute food where emergencies exist. And, when pressed hard enough, he will, When Negroes in Dallas County, already warmed up by the Selma civil rights activities in 1965, began demonstrating loudly because they wanted food, Federal officials told Dallas County leaders the food was coming in, and if they wouldn't distribute it, civil rights leaders would. Dallas County surrendered and took the goods, but the scope of the victory is disputed. Some say it only hardened the will of surrounding counties to resist.

This kind of tugging and heaving reveals the great weakness of the food programs: commercial interests of the South use them for reprisal and coercion. They are the political and social weapons of a region. Free Federal food was valued by the Delta planters for many years because, by allowing their hired hands to live off it through the winter, it became a kind of subsidy for the farmers. (Free commodities were never given to Delta Negroes after spring plowing time, because a little hunger was expected to make them eager to earn $3 a day in the fields.)

But now that farming has become almost totally mechanized, field hands are, as one planter put it, "as useless as a mule." They and their shotgun shanties only clutter the landscape, chafing the consciences and the pocketbooks of the region. Get rid of them. And what better way than to shift to a food program they cannot afford? Half of the Delta counties have already dropped the commodities and put in food stamps. "What does that mean?" asked Amzie Moore, a Negro leader from Cleveland, Miss. "That means starve or go to Chicago. Well, we're not going to Chicago. We don't want the stamps unless it's a free stamp program."

The angry Negroes have some support. That faint thunder in the distance may develop into a real challenge. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has circulated a memo implying that Freeman has ignored his obvious powers to bring relief. The commission urges free food stamps for the penniless and both programs operating simultaneously in the poorest counties. The leaders of Reuther's Citizens Crusade want to strip Freeman of his role in distributing food and turn the whole job over to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare—which was in fact Senator John Kennedy's proposal in 1959. The Crusade is putting out some pretty snappish statements about the preeminence of nutrition over profits. And now Senator Javits has asked the Senate Executive Reorganization Subcommittee to consider the "strip Freeman" proposal.

If impoverished Southerners are judged strictly as an economic factor, more food to keep them alive can be viewed skeptically as merely a temporary solution to the problem of making them profitable. But for them temporariness has always been a relative matter, and they would probably just as soon be fed even on that basis—for, as one high Citizens Crusade official pointed out: "We've been keeping them alive on a temporary basis for 300 years." Something more permanent, he felt, is not wholly impossible and is "limited only by the amount of money that American capitalism, with its Dixiecrat-dominated agriculture committees in Congress, is willing to spend to create a 20th-century civilization in the South." The vagueness of the statement is important; here is a man who for a lifetime has been professionally concerned with labor and housing conditions of the Southern poor, and yet he has no specific plans to improve them, and the specific planners have not come much farther.

Many say that the salvation of the hungry Negro lies in modification of the agricultural South with industry. It is an old dream. Since the days of Gov. Hugh White's "Balance Agriculture With Industry" program a generation ago, Mississippi has been trying to bring in the smokestacks, and the same has been true for the South as a whole since the days of Henry Grady. Yet the skies over the South's vast boondocks are just about as blue and unsmudged as ever. Others, including such practical groups as the Southern Regional Council, are pushing for farm cooperatives to give the landed Negro independence from a repressive social structure. But this, too, though spottily successful, is something that has been tried off and on for years without more than denting the general poverty of the black farmer.

These efforts and failures are quite beside the point to the Negro who faces another one-meal, beans-only day. Very much to the point is the knowledge that his life can be changed, and immediately, by the simplest of Agriculture Department flats.

If change does come, it will probably take some powerful motivating emotion to achieve it. But there is hope for that, too. When Robert Kennedy returned from his safari into Mississippi's shanty jungles, he told of seeing people who eat one meal every two days, but he described the results only as "extreme hunger." For politicians, "starvation" is a smut word. They don't like to come right out and say it exists in this country—so it becomes "hunger" or "malnutrition"—and even less do they like to see that which the taboo word describes; it embarasses them. Testifying before a Senate group about swollen bellies and running sores and all the cottonpatch grotesqueries he had seen, Kennedy several times became so embarrassed he laughed. The last best hope of "extremely hungry" folks is that that discomfort will spread.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the purposes or objectives of this bill, that it does not amend any of the sections covered by this bill or the subject matter touched on by this bill.

This bill relates only to sections 15 and 16. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York relates to section 5 of the Food Stamp Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RYAN. Briefly, Mr. Chairman, on that point.

The purpose of the bill before us, H.R. 1318, as spelled out in its title, is to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964. My amendment would do just that. It would be an amendment to the Food Stamp Act of 1964, just as have been the amendments offered and debated during the course of the afternoon.

I submit that the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANDRUM). The Chair is ready to rule.

The bill, which has been amended, amends two sections of existing law.

The proposed amendment to add another section to the pending bill would amend a third section of existing law.

The Chair rules, therefore, that the amendment is germane.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I support the food stamp program as it was enacted into law in 1964. Some Members of the House have had no firsthand experience with this program so I think it might be well to explain just how it works.

First of all, the county or city or the local unit of government must want the program. They must ask for it. This request is made to the State agency which is charged with the operation of State-administered, or aided relief programs.

Thus, not only must the local unit approve, but so also must the individual State government. The Federal Government does not deal directly with the local unit. The program is designed in this manner so as to maximize State control and regulation, and to minimize overlapping of administrative responsibility. The crux of the Federal direction is the requirement that the State must use the same criteria for food stamp eligibility as is used for its own welfare programs. This assures the Federal Government of uniformity of regulation in keeping with the State's existing programs. Further, it assures the Federal Government of the employment of the regular State administrative machinery in the determination of eligibility for the program. The State is also responsible for the safekeeping and transmittal of the food stamps to the individual participant.

Each year, following the congressional appropriation, Federal food stamp officials enter into extensive discussions with the States. Each State then determines

the priority of counties within the State and submits formal requests for participation in the program. New areas are then designated to insure equitable national distribution.

Once a new area is designated, a program of instruction and information is begun to fully acquaint the locality with the program.

The next step is certification of eligible families and the issuance of identification cards. This is done by regular, local welfare personnel. Families are certified for a specific amount of bonus coupons, dependent on need, income and assets. Each family is required to contribute toward the purchase of coupons that amount of money which it would normally spend on groceries. Both the amount the families pay and the value of the bonus coupons are limited, and this will vary from State to State, dependent on local conditions.

The family must then budget its income in order to have on hand the necessary money when the authorization to purchase is received. This authorization to purchase is set up on a monthly, biweekly, or weekly basis. Food coupons can be purchased when the participant shows his identification card and surrenders his authorization to purchase and pays his share of the cost. The amount of the authorization and the family's share will change as the family's circumstances change.

The local agency decides where the coupons will be sold but it is unusually banks or government offices. Once the individual has the coupons in hand, he may spend them as he would money in any approved retail food store. Retal outlets—grocery stores—may win approval simply by demonstrating they are a bona fide retail food outlet and have a knowledge of the rules and willingness to comply with them. The rules are simple and pertain principally to proper identification of the purchaser and the eligibility of the merchandise. Imported foods, tobacco, alcoholic beverages, and nonfood items are prohibited. The store owner handles the coupons just as he would money, depositing them in his bank. The bank is reimbursed for deposited coupons by the Treasury Department through the normal banking channels.

Cooperation among store owners and banks has been excellent. The stores vary from the simplest corner store to the largest of the chain-operated outlets. The stores are checked out from time to time by a limited staff of Federal employees who divide their time between the food stamp program and other activities of the Consumer and Marketing Service.

Briefly, that is how the program works. Now, I would like to just recap the highlights of the program:

First. It is a voluntary program.

Second. It is administered by the States through existing channels.

Third. The food is getting to those who need it and in proportion to their needs.

Fourth. It is a model of administrative simplicity and is working very smoothly.

Fifth. Abuse of the program is minimal—almost nonexistent.

Sixth. The cost-benefit ratio is very low.

Seventh. It has expanded farm markets.

Eighth. It stimulates the overall economy in every area where it operates.

The present food stamp program results from one of the outstanding legislative accomplishments of the 88th Congress. It should be continued as it is now operating.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my unqualified support for extension of the food stamp program as presently operative.

The program, in making food available at discount price to low-income families, has received an enthusiastic reception in Hawaii, with approximately 6,000 participants who will purchase an estimated $405,192 worth of coupons in fiscal 1968.

The food stamp program, which benefits some 2 million people throughout the country at present, is operative in 229 congressional districts, and many others have applied for inclusion. This simple expedient of enabling needy people to obtain about $26 worth of food for $20 in coupon purchases, has drawn the support of the public, retail merchants, and State and local governments, as an effective way to allow poor people to meet their family's basic nutritional needs without any sacrifice of dignity.

The program was inaugurated in Oahu, Hawaii, on April 12, 1966. Only 300 families in the State had signed up for the program in its early stages; now 1,911 families or 7,412 individuals benefit from this assistance; more will be added, hopefully in the near future. By Presidential designation, Maui and Kauai Counties were added on September 10, 1966, as among 402 new food stamp districts. The State administration of Gov. John A. Burns has moved expeditiously to implement the program and arrange for the necessary administrative costs; it recognizes fully how this remarkably simple food utilization program adds to the variety of social services extended to our citizens in greatest need. The county of Hawaii was designated to receive such aid on January 23, 1967, by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman; the inauguration of the Hawaii County program as of April 3 of this year means that food stamps are available in every area of my State.

According to April figures released by Christina Lam, food stamp coordinator for the State department of social services, these 1,911 families received $149,200 worth of groceries for $106,758 of their own money. The need for the program is emphasized in an article by Barbara Milz, "Food Stamp Program Turns Out Quite a Tasty Dish," which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of May 11, and which I am adding at the end of this statement as a record of the need for continuing food stamps.

I have heard no serious criticism leveled at this Federal-State cooperative program, have heard of no charges of misuse or fraud in connection with it. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am filled with dismay at the inclusion in H.R. 1318 of an amendment that will require the participating local political subdivisions to pay 20 percent of the bonus costs effective July 1, 1969. I am at a loss as to the logic of such a provision which I fear will effectively kill the program in many, if not all, areas. In calling for the States to meet a modest share of the cost of this program, the committee report expresses the view that "State and local cost sharing will bring greater local responsibility and control into the operation of this program" without documenting a single instance of the absence of such local responsibility. Indeed, since the program is a voluntary one, requiring administrative arrangements and the bearing of costs for same on the part of the States, we have prima facie evidence of local sharing of the responsibility wherever the program is in operation. Administrative costs borne by the States include those for such activities as data processing, checkwriting, making payments to the banks for issuing coupons, and paying the salaries of local administrative personnel.

It is probably true that many of the congressional districts not now participating in the food stamp program have been held back by the necessity for meeting these administrative expenses, and I fear that the pending amendment requiring assumption of 20 percent of the bonus costs of the stamps will not only effectively keep all nonparticipating districts from ever applying, but will eliminate Hawaii and many other States from future participation.

Using the Department of Agriculture projections made available to us by our very able colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri, who is leading the fight against adoption of this amendment, I note that Hawaii's participation by fiscal 1970 will approximate $500,000 worth of bonus coupons. This means that passage of the 20-percent amendment will require my State to appropriate $100,000 per year in addition to the costs it is already bearing.

Mr. Chairman, the food stamp program has always been a federally initiated project and should remain so if its benefits are to continue. As far back as the 86th Congress, legislation was passed to allow for distribution of food to needy citizens under a stamp plan, but it remained for President Kennedy to exercise the Executive authority to actually put such a plan into operation in 1961. This pilot program of assistance to eight depressed communities was expanded to a nationwide operation with the passage of H.R. 10222 in 1964 and the subsequent signing of Public Law 88–525 by President Johnson on August 31 of that year.

The President requested an appropriation of $195 million for this program in fiscal 1968, and I applaud the Agriculture Committee's recognition of the value of the plan by authorizing the full amount requested. One Member after another has stood up in this debate to extol the food stamp program for its effectiveness in his district, and the only arguments I have heard expressed against it are to the effect that we are already doing too much for the poor in America. Mr. Chairman, I submit that in a land as prosperous as ours when there are still vast numbers of citizens, young and old, not capable of adequately feeding themselves, then we are not

doing nearly as much as conscience and humanity demand. To deprive some 2 million people of this one additional means of securing the very basics of life can only be regarded as a reversal of the great strides we have made in attempting to provide a richer, fuller life for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to extend the food stamp program without the 20 percent amendment so that we may not witness the slow demise of this meaningful and vital Federal assistance to the less fortunate among us.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Advertiser, May 11, 1967]

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM TURNS OUT QUITE A TASTY DISH

(By Barbara Milz)

Food stamps issued under a joint Federal-State program added more than $42,263 worth of food to the tables of low-income Hawaii families last month.

"I just wish we could tell everybody about this," said Christina Lam, food stamp coordinator for the State Department of Social Services.

"All our lower income families should be able to eat better, and through this program, we can help them do so."

When the food stamp started in Hawaii a year ago, only 300 families signed up. The rolls now list 1,911 families—7,412 individuals.

"This isn't simply a welfare program," Miss Lam said. "It's a program that helps these people help themselves."

Miss Lam explained that while many of the food stamp plan members are on welfare, some are not. "We even have student families, families where the couple is attending the University and getting by on very little income," she said.

"We couldn't aid them in any other way, but with this food stamp program, we're seeing well fed, healthy babies.

"Tomato puree is much cheaper than canned tomatoes. Mainland eggs are just as good as Island eggs, and they're much cheaper. And we're teaching our participants things like this."

"This is an educational program, too. We have an obligation to teach the people to make better use of food, to serve better meals with what they have."

Miss Lam named with obvious pride members of the advisory committee of nutritionists who work out low-cost menus and recipes for the food program participants.

Participating members in the program receive a new recipe or a shopping hint each month. "They complain if they don't," Miss Lam said.

"And this is the first time many of our people using the program have been in banks.

"The people who qualify for the program come in here to the Social Services Department and are certified for the program.

"They receive an authorization to purchase food coupons and an identity card.

"Then, the person goes to the bank once a month with his authorization, and buys the food coupons there. Only, he gets more coupons than he pays for."

Miss Lam pulled out a chart to explain. "Say for instance you are living alone and your net income is $100 a month. You would be paying about $20 for food items alone. If you spend that $20 for food coupons, you'd get $26 worth of coupons."

Miss Lam pointed to another line in the chart. "Look at this one. If a five-member family has a net income of $275 a month, they can spend $84 for food stamps. For this amount they will receive food stamps worth $112. That's an increase of $28 they can spend for food."

"Mamas like this plan. Papa can't use the food stamps for beer."

Miss Lam switched back to banks and the food stamp plan.

"The First National Bank, all but in some places on the Big Island, is where our people go to buy their food stamps. The banks have been cooperating beautifully.

"For many of our people this is the first time they've ever been in a bank. It's one of those things we're doing that's educational.

"The banks get a tiny service fee for handling this, but we think it's important to get our people into banks, get them used to things other people are used to.

"When people first come into our program, some are disappointed because they think we are going to give them money.

"We don't. They have to make that first investment on their own. They have to use their own money to buy the stamps, but then they get so much more for their money that way."

April figures show that the 1,911 families in the program here spent $106,758 of their own money for food. For this they received $149,200 worth of groceries in the stores.

The Federal government will pay the grocers for the stamps the stores accept instead of cash.

"It's so much better than the old surplus food program," Miss Lam said.

"Under that, the people got only what happened to be in surplus at the time. Our local people might not like too much beans, corn meal, that sort of thing. But that's what they got under the old program.

"And the butter we used to get," Miss Lam remembered, shuddering slightly. "It would come in by ship, and there wouldn't be room for it on the docks, and it would get all melting, and we'd have to scurry around trying to find a place to store it until we could get it to the people. This program is ever so much better.

"But so many of the people remember the old program, and they may think the new program is like that. They need to be convinced that the program is good before they'll sign up.

"It's a long, slow process, getting all the eligible families told about the program. Please help us get them the word!"

Miss Lam also wanted people to be told that if they can't get to the department to sign up, it's possible a worker can visit them at home.

"We know it's difficult for some people to come in here," she said. "Ask those in rural areas to call us at 507–711, ext 262, and we'll take the applications in the field.

"We'll also call at the homes of people who are too elderly to get around easily, or who otherwise just can't get to our office.

"On the Neighbor Islands, the low income families can get the same service by calling their Social Services office there."

Miss Lam is armed with comemnts from people who like the food stamp program.

A telling statement from a mother of 10 children sums up the feeling: "I wish they had it when I was a child."

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation to continue and expand the food stamp program, but in opposition to the committee amendment requiring 20-percent cost sharing by the States.

Pennsylvania is one of 16 States which passes along a 50-percent administrative cost charge to its municipalities under existing law, so there is already cost sharing in certification and coupon costs. Since the principal need for a Federal assistance program to aid needy households with grocery bills stems from the fact that States and localities were unable to raise the funds to finance public assistance programs that would provide a minimum level of food for low-income families, it is unrealistic to expect that these same governments could now absorb an additional 20 percent of the cost of bonus coupons. In my county of Allegheny this would amount to an additional $700,000.

In Allegheny County 60 percent of the people participating in the food stamp program are also public welfare recipients; so States and localities already contribute significant sums indirectly to the program in the form of moneys used by welfare people to make regular coupon purchases. Pennsylvania would then have to contribute to the cost of bonus coupons for families not on welfare, as well as those receiving assistance, because many families who would qualify for assistance in the Federal food stamp program do not qualify for public assistance.

Public assistance is probably the most complex social welfare problem in this country, and one of the greatest difficulties in Pennsylvania has been funding. Until all of our States and municipalities are able to prove their readiness and ability to raise revenues for this purpose, I believe it is the continuing obligation of government to continue to support the distribution of food and nutrition to low-income families.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of H.R. 1318 without the 20-percent cost-sharing proposal—and the immediate restoration of the authorization for this program when the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill reaches the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I support the food stamp program because it has proven to be one of our better programs for the relief of poverty.

The self-help principle which is a feature of food stamps should be encouraged.

I hope that my colleagues realize that the program is not a handout from Washington. States and localities must spend their own funds to cooperate in the program. In addition, the recipients must purchase approximately 66 percent of the food stamps which they receive in order to obtain the bonus coupons. Imported foods, tobacco, liquor, and nonfood items may not be purchased with food stamps.

I regret that the House Committee on Agriculture saw fit to include the amendment requiring 20-percent State participation. I am convinced that retention of the cost-sharing provision will result in discontinuance of the program in most States because of the difficulties most States are experiencing with their budgets.

States and localities already share in the cost of the program. They are paying the costs of administration which amount to 7 percent of the Federal participation. To require additional cost sharing is unrealistic.

It should be brought out that farmers are benefiting from the program as well as the needy. It utilizes their ability to produce and helps prevent surpluses by moving additional foodstuffs through the marketplace to the consuming public.

It does not displace money normally spent for food.

It increases the food budgets of those who are qualified to participate.

Increased sale of food and its consumption has been reflected in every study conducted on this program. An analysis of one of the pilot programs showed a 24-percent gain in grain products consumption through direct use of cereal products and increased meat consumption. Consumption of fresh vegetables was shown to have doubled. Use of fresh fruits was up 70 percent. To the housewife, this means a pound of hamburger rather than neckbones. To the child, it means an apple or an orange in his lunch box. To the farmer, it means a bigger market for his produce.

By the end of this fiscal year that expanded market will consist of 2 million people in 42 States. This is an expanded market for American food products.

The economic stimulus from this increased retail activity benefits the total economy of these areas and our farmers share in that as well.

I urge elimination of the committee amendments and passage of the Sullivan bill as originally introduced.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the food stamp plan sponsored by my good friend and distinguished colleague, Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN, of Missouri, and against the amendment recommended by the Committee on Agriculture.

We have before us today a bill which was so amended by the Committee that it would destroy the food stamp program which is functioning successfully in 40 States and which will be expanded to others if it is permitted to continue in operation.

The 20-percent State participation provision would unquestionably compel Washington and other participating States to withdraw from the program. The director of the Washington State Department of Public Assistance estimates that Washington would have to contribute several million dollars under provisions of the amendment. I urge that this Committee amendment be stricken from the bill in order to restore the original legislation sponsored by Congresswoman SULLIVAN.

The food stamp plan is a successful operation and it should be expanded rather than terminated. I believe that we in Congress should enact more programs which incorporate the self-help features which are a part of the food stamp plan.

Self-reliance and industriousness are encouraged when participants in a Government program are required to pay approximately two-thirds of the cost of assistance, as is the case with the food stamp program. The fact that the remaining one-third of the stamps are received as a bonus permits a more balanced and healthy diet of most unfortunate citizens who are required to resort to the program.

When the nine more Washington State counties now scheduled to enter the food stamp program by early summer start their programs, all but three of the State's 39 counties will be offering this food help to their needy and low-income residents.

One of the reasons that Washington localities have adopted the food stamp plan so widely is that the program is not only less expensive to administer than surplus food distribution but also is more effective in improving the diets of the poor.

The low-income persons currently enjoying the benefits of being able to buy more and better food than they could before the coming of food stamps are strong supporters of the plan, too. For example, in Oakville, Wash., in my district, there is a mother of eight children who is an enthusiastic user of food stamps. Each month she puts $116 of her own money into Federal food coupons, and receives in return a total value of $160 in coupons to be spent on foods of her choice. She says that food stamps enable her to feed her family much better, and her eight healthy youngsters, ranging in age from 3 to 13, testify to her attention to nutrition.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, last week the Senate, by a unanimous vote, accepted in essence the extension of the Food Stamp Act for another 3 years as proposed by the President. The great weight of evidence points to the fact that the Senate acted wisely and that we should today vote to extend the act without any change in the administration or the methods of cost sharing.

As I have said in the past, the Food Stamp Act has justified itself by performing smoothly and efficiently during the last 3 years and, most of all, it has given poor families throughout the country a means to obtain an adequate supply of food which in the past had been denied them by rising food costs.

Mr. Chairman, the food stamp programs have on the whole been admirably administered by local agencies and the overall direction of the act has been commendable. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has lent his dynamic and outstanding leadership to the effort and I think the results are ample testimony to his success.

I foresee a great future for the food stamp programs and I foresee an even greater impact toward relieving the tremendous and overpowering burden of providing a livable subsistence which bears most heavily on those whose economic resources are limited.

Mr. Chairman, the Food Stamp Act provides a dignified means for a poor family to help themselves to an adequate supply of nourishment. This act is a means of strengthening our Nation by assuring food to those in the lowest economic strata.

The proposal to add a cost of 20 percent of the bonus coupons on the existing cost to the States is unrealistic and will make the program infeasible in many areas. The States and localities already hold absolute control of the program and they presently contribute a percentage of the total cost of the program. To require more is to place an unjustifiable burden on these governments.

The Food Stamp Act was passed by the Congress as a national program and as a supplement to the States in their efforts to aid the poor, not as a measure to add to their burdens.

I am hopeful and I urge most strongly that we reject any proposal which would work to compound the problems of the poor in the areas where those hardships are most severe.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the food stamp program as it presently exists.

In order to maintain the program in its present form it is necessary to amend the bill, H.R. 1318, to eliminate the 20-percent State participation requirement. I urge that this provision be eliminated because if it is retained it will certainly mean the end of the program in the State of California. In that connection I wish to correct the RECORD with regard to the effect of the 20-percent State participation provision of the program in the State of California. During the general debate on the bill my good friend and colleague from California [Mr. TEAGUE] stated that our Governor, the Honorable Ronald Reagan, had not expressed concern over the State participation amendment.

Without objection I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of a memo which was prepared by the California State Department of Social Welfare under the administration of State Welfare Director John Montgomery, who was appointed by Governor Reagan. This memorandum sets forth the fact that additional funds in the amount of $1,258,327 would be required to be appropriated by the legislature or provided by the participating counties to maintain the program at its present level if the present amendment were adopted.

The memo strongly urges the deletion of the State contribution portion of the bill and solidifies the opinion of those of us who maintain the 20-percent cost-sharing proposal would have the effect of killing the food stamp program.

The California State Department of Social Welfare memorandum is reprinted herewith:

CALIFORNIA FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

1. ISSUE

The House Agriculture Committee approved (March 20, 1967) the extension and budget authorization for the Food Stamp Program. However, H.R. 1318 was amended by the committee to require, *effective July 1, 1969, participation by state (or county) to the extent of 20% of the bonus food stamps.*

2. FACTS

Throughout the whole history of the Federal Food Stamp Program (which in its infancy was designed to move surplus foods to needy families) the cost of the "bonus stamps" was assumed as a basic responsibility of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

NOTE.—The program operates by low-income families purchasing a certain amount of stamps to which is added additional "bonus" stamps to increase their food purchasing power. These bonus stamps have heretofore been financed 100% by the Federal Government.

The actual value of bonus stamps in California for February 1967 amounted to $524,303 or $6,291,636 annually. If HR 1318 passes with the present amendment, it would require an additional appropriation by the Legislature (or by those counties now par-

ticipating) of $1,258,327—not counting future expansion.

3. DISCUSSION

The Food Stamp Program is not considered to be a welfare program. It is specifically designed to expand agricultural markets through enlarged food purchasing power of low-income groups. This is traditionally—and properly—a function of the Federal Government operating through the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

If the statute is changed to require state participation in the cost of bonus stamps, it is no longer an agricultural program but just another one of many public assistance programs with all the complexities of differing matching formulae, different agencies exercising overlapping functions, etc.

A continuing trend by the Federal Government of adopting federally financed programs and then shifting a portion of the burden to already overburdened state and local funds can only contribute to increasing fiscal chaos in state and local government financing. In California such action is almost certain to kill the program, rather than continue to stimulate the agricultural markets and benefit low-income families.

4. RECOMMENDATION

The State Department of Social Welfare strongly urges the deletion of any requirement in the way of state contributions to the cost of bonus stamps to avoid lose of benefits supplementing public assistance and other low-income families, and to continue the present stimulus to California agriculture.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment which would require the States to pay 20 percent of the cost of participation in the program.

I strongly support the food stamp program. My constituents, particularly in the eastern half of my district, have greatly benefited by this program. It has enabled them to obtain a more nutritious, better balanced diet.

Adoption of the committee amendment would mean that Kentucky would have to pay one-fifth of the cost of the program, although it is financially unable to do so.

Therefore, I strongly urge that the committee amendment be rejected and that the bill be passed. A vote for the bill and a vote against the committee amendment would be votes for the poor and undernourished children of Appalachia and for many of our senior citizens who have no subsistence, except what they receive in the form of old-age assistance or social security. In most cases, these old-age assistance and social security payments are unrealistically small. Therefore, I once again strongly urge defeat of the committee amendment and passage of the bill.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, the food stamp plan has proven to be a most effective program and I support its continuation in its present form.

I urge adoption of the amendment to remove the 20-percent State participation feature which would have the effect of wrecking the program.

In that connection, I would like to take note of the efforts which have been put forth by my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable CHARLES A. VANIK, on behalf of the establishment of the program in Cleveland. Representative VANIK's effort on the subject of laudatory comment which appeared in an editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on May 30, 1967. In addition, the editorial praises the program in its present form and urges that the crippling 20 percent state participation amendment be eliminated.

Without objection, I would like to include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

SAVE THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

People living in poverty areas in Cleveland are in danger of being scorched by a bill scheduled for floor action in the U.S. House Monday.

Food stamps have kept welfare families afloat despite welfare grants which give them only about 78% of minimum living costs. Food stamps since 1963 have given the poor a chance to add 25% more bread, macaroni and maybe meat and eggs to their scanty diets.

The Senate Agriculture Committee has approved not just extending the present stamp system three years but expanding it.

But House Resolution 1318 has one amendment in it which can go off like a booby trap and sink this lifesaver. The amendment would require the state of Ohio, which never paid anything into the food stamp program, to ante up $3.5 million, which is 20% of the program's cost. This amendment should be killed.

Gov. James A. Rhodes has warned that if the bill passes with the amendment as it now is, food stamps would probably have to be abolished in Ohio.

For the poor, this is not a matter of a dollar or two more in taxes. They would have to pay for this new federal economy in bread and macaroni and meat and eggs. They would have to eat less.

U.S. Rep. Charles A. Vanik, D–21, has fought valiantly for the food stamp program. He is the one who landed it for Greater Cleveland four years ago. He took the floor to plead that food stamps be kept going at their present level.

More than 19,500 families in Cuyahoga County manage to put on their tables $453,000 worth of food each month, food they could not have if the stamp program got blasted.

Ohio is wrestling with the basic cost of welfare. The state and the counties are worrying out how to bring their poor relief measures to a subsistence standard.

To take away their food stamps now would be a blow to the breadbasket. It would compound the misery of children and adults who have a grim enough survival problem, living in the most troubled part of town.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, 3 years ago, at its inception, I opposed the food stamp program because I felt it was ill conceived, and for the benefit of farmers and merchants more than for the benefit of the needy. I thought this because, while it is basically intended as a welfare program, it had a number of serious flaws. Let me name a few:

First. It is not coordinated with other Federal, State, or local welfare programs.

Second. It requires the welfare family to spend a prescribed portion of family income on food whether or not this is the family's primary need at the time.

Third. It is administered at high cost by the Agriculture Department. It should be under a Federal, State, or local department concerned with welfare.

Fourth. It pays a full profit markup on each dollar of subsidy provided. No one should make a profit from welfare needs.

Fifth. Its application over the Nation is spotty and inequitable. In December of 1966, only 42,074 Ohioans received help, while 411,205 from Mississippi benefited.

Sixth. It encourages States to avoid their responsibility for participation in and support for legitimate welfare programs.

These defects in the program have been substantiated by the performance since, and the program should be radically overhauled or abandoned.

However, having gone into operation, there are now many communities that are so reliant upon the program that it cannot be abandoned without creating a danger of severe privation and hardship to those who can least afford it. Nor does any other alternate support adequate to replace the program appear likely of enactment. For this reason only, I shall support the bill this year.

At the same time, I shall support the committee amendment to require State participation to the extent of 20 percent in fiscal 1969. Such a change would be an improvement since it would improve administration, and it would help eliminate improper inflation of the program at the expense of other welfare efforts.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the 20-percent increase proposed in the States participation in the cost of the food stamp program. In my opinion, such an assessment will place the program in great jeopardy. I fear that many States, including my own State of New York, would be forced to discontinue the program. Those who need the program—persons in the lowest income brackets and those on public assistance—will be the ones to suffer. The food stamp program has been an important one in combatting poverty and is permitting these people to receive adequate amounts of proper food.

Mr. Chairman, I also strongly oppose the limiting of fund authorization through fiscal 1967. As introduced, H.R. 1318 provided for "open end" authorization. I think this provision should be restored to the bill.

The food stamp program, put into effect by Public Law 525 of the 88th Congress, authorized appropriations for 3 years through June 30 of this year. The program requires the participating family to use some of its own income to purchase food, and provides them with the opportunity to buy more food and better food for less money. This is not a welfare program. Eligible individuals and families who choose to participate exchange an amount of money equal to about 60 percent of their food allowance for food stamps worth more. The U.S. Department of Agriculture pays the difference between the amount the family pays and the value of the coupons it receives. Participation by individuals and households is voluntary. In this great country of ours with an abundance of food, there is no reason for any American to go hungry, or lack a proper, nutritious diet.

Although the food stamp program is not yet in operation in New York City, it has been in operation in other sections of New York State. We have requested the program for New York City for fiscal 1968 and the Department of Agriculture

is expected to give approval if we have State funds available to match the Federal funds. It is estimated that 200,000 in New York will benefit if the program goes into effect. However, at the projected level of the program for next year, the 20-percent assessment would cost my State $6 million for the food stamp program—an increase of $4.4 million. In all likelihood we will not be able to continue and extend the program in New York if the 20-percent increase in State participation remains in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, 41 States and the District of Columbia now support the food stamp program. More than 2 million needy, low-income families throughout the country are being assisted. Many other States, including New York, want and need this program. The States participating and those wishing to participate should not be penalized by a burdensome 20-percent additional cost.

I call on my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting the amendment to eliminate this increase and also to support the amendment to restore the "open end" authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1318) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to House Resolution 471, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment on page 2, line 3.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on the other amendment? If not, the question is on the other amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 3, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 15 of the Food Stamp Act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"'(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each State shall be responsible for financing, from funds available to the State or political subdivision thereof, 20 per centum of the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments. Each State shall transfer such sums to, and they shall be made a part of, the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. Each State shall transfer such sums to such account within one calendar month following the calendar month in which the coupon allotments are issued to eligible households. The provisions of this subsection shall not be effective for any coupon allotments issued prior to July 1, 1969, to enable each State to take such action as is necessary under the statutes of the States to comply with the provisions of this subsection.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 191, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—173

Abbitt	Ford, Gerald R.	O'Neal, Ga.
Abernethy	Fountain	Passman
Adair	Frelinghuysen	Pettis
Andrews, Ala.	Fulton, Pa.	Pickle
Arends	Fuqua	Pirnie
Ashbrook	Gardner	Poage
Ashmore	Gathings	Poff
Baring	Goodell	Price, Tex.
Bates	Goodling	Railsback
Belcher	Gross	Rarick
Bell	Grover	Reid, Ill.
Bennett	Gurney	Reinecke
Berry	Hagan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Betts	Haley	Riegle
Biester	Hall	Rivers
Bolton	Halleck	Roberts
Brinkley	Hammer-schmidt	Robison
Broomfield		Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Hansen, Idaho	Roth
Broyhill, N.C.	Hardy	Roudebush
Broyhill, Va.	Harvey	Rumsfeld
Buchanan	Henderson	Sandman
Burke, Fla.	Herlong	Satterfield
Burleson	Hosmer	Schadeberg
Bush	Hutchinson	Scherle
Byrnes, Wis.	Jarman	Schneebeli
Cabell	Johnson, Pa.	Schweiker
Cascy	Jones, N.C.	Scott
Cederberg	Keith	Shriver
Chamberlain	King, N.Y.	Sikes
Clancy	Kleppe	Skubitz
Clawson, Del	Kornegay	Smith, N.Y.
Cleveland	Kyl	Smith, Okla.
Collier	Laird	Snyder
Colmer	Landrum	Springer
Conable	Langen	Stafford
Conte	Lennon	Steiger, Ariz.
Cowger	Lipscomb	Steiger, Wis.
Cramer	Lloyd	Stephens
Cunningham	Lukens	Stubblefield
Curtis	McClure	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	McEwen	Taft
Davis, Wis.	MacGregor	Talcott
de la Garza	Mahon	Taylor
Dellenback	Maillliard	Teague, Calif.
Denney	Marsh	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	Martin	Tuck
Dickinson	Mathias, Calif.	Utt
Dole	May	Watkins
Dorn	Mayne	Watson
Dowdy	Meskill	Whalley
Downing	Michel	Wiggins
Edwards, Ala.	Miller, Ohio	Williams, Pa.
Erlenborn	Minshall	Wilson, Bob
Esch	Montgomery	Winn
Eshleman	Morris, N. Mex.	Wydler
Findley	Morton	Wylie
Fisher	Myers	Wyman

NAYS—191

Adams	Daddario	Gonzalez
Addabbo	Daniels	Gray
Albert	Delaney	Green, Oreg.
Anderson, Tenn.	Diggs	Green, Pa.
	Dingell	Griffiths
Annunzio	Donohue	Gude
Ashley	Dulski	Halpern
Aspinall	Duncan	Hamilton
Barrett	Dwyer	Hanna
Bevill	Eckhardt	Hansen, Wash.
Bingham	Edmondson	Hathaway
Blanton	Edwards, Calif.	Hawkins
Blatnik	Edwards, La.	Hays
Boggs	Ellberg	Hechler, W. Va.
Boland	Everett	Helstoski
Brademas	Evins, Tenn.	Hicks
Brasco	Fallon	Holifield
Brooks	Farbstein	Howard
Brown, Calif.	Fascell	Hull
Brown, Mich.	Feighan	Hungate
Burke, Mass.	Flood	Hunt
Burton, Calif.	Foley	Irwin
Button	Ford, William D.	Jacobs
Byrne, Pa.		Joelson
Cahill	Fraser	Johnson, Calif.
Carter	Friedel	Jones, Ala.
Celler	Fulton, Tenn.	Karsten
Cohelan	Gallifianakis	Karth
Conyers	Gallagher	Kastenmeier
Corbett	Garmatz	Kazen
Corman	Gibbons	Kee
Culver	Gilbert	Kelly
King, Calif.	Nichols	Selden
Kirwan	Nix	Shipley
Kupferman	O'Hara, Ill.	Sisk
Kuykendall	O'Hara, Mich.	Slack
Kyros	Olsen	Staggers
Latta	O'Neill, Mass.	Steed
Leggett	Ottinger	Sullivan
Long, Md.	Patten	Tenzer
McCarthy	Pepper	Tiernan
McDade	Perkins	Tunney
McDonald, Mich.	Philbin	Udall
	Pollock	Van Deerlin
McFall	Price, Ill.	Vanik
McMillan	Pucinski	Vigorito
Macdonald, Mass.	Quillen	Waggonner
	Randall	Waldie
Machen	Rees	Walker
Madden	Reid, N.Y.	Wampler
Mathias, Md.	Reifel	Watts
Matsunaga	Resnick	White
Miller, Calif.	Reuss	Whitener
Minish	Rhodes, Pa.	Whitten
Mink	Rodino	Widnall
Monagan	Rogers, Colo.	Wilson, Charles H.
Moore	Ronan	
Moorhead	Rooney, Pa.	Wolff
Morgan	Rosenthal	Wright
Morse, Mass.	Rostenkowski	Yates
Moss	Roush	Young
Multer	Roybal	Zablocki
Murphy, Ill.	Ryan	Zion
Murphy, N.Y.	St Germain	Zwach
Natcher	Saylor	
Nedzi	Scheuer	

NOT VOTING—69

Anderson, Ill.	Giaimo	Pike
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gubser	Pool
	Hanley	Pryor
Ayres	Harrison	Purcell
Battin	Harsha	Quie
Blackburn	Hébert	Rooney, N.Y.
Bolling	Heckler, Mass.	Ruppe
Bow	Holland	St. Onge
Bray	Horton	Schwengel
Brock	Ichord	Smith, Calif.
Brotzman	Jonas	Smith, Iowa
Burton, Utah	Jones, Mo.	Stanton
Carey	Kluczynski	Stratton
Clark	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Clausen, Don H.	McClory	Thompson, Ga.
	McCulloch	Thompson, N.J.
Dawson	Meeds	Ullman
Dent	Mills	Vander Jagt
Devine	Mize	Whalen
Dow	Mosher	Williams, Miss.
Evans, Colo.	Nelsen	Willis
Fino	O'Konski	Wyatt
Flynt	Patman	Younger
Gettys	Pelly	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Jonas for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Pryor against.

Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Meeds against.

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. McClory for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.

Mrs. Heckler for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Smith of California for, with Mr. Hanley against.

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Horton against.

Mr. Pool for with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Giaimo against.

Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Ruppe against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holland with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Patman with McCulloch.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Stanton.

Mr. Dow with Mr. Vander Jagt.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Pike with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Quie with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Schwengel with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Mize with Mr. Pelly.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BELCHER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BELCHER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1318, to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 128, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—230

Adams	Eckhardt	Howard
Addabbo	Edmondson	Hull
Albert	Edwards, Calif.	Hungate
Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, La.	Hunt
Annunzio	Eilberg	Irwin
Ashley	Esch	Jacobs
Aspinall	Everett	Joelson
Barrett	Evins, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.
Bevill	Fallon	Johnson, Pa.
Biester	Farbstein	Jones, Ala.
Bingham	Fascell	Jones, N.C.
Blanton	Feighan	Karsten
Blatnik	Flood	Karth
Boggs	Foley	Kastenmeier
Boland	Ford, William D.	Kazen
Brademas	Fountain	Kee
Brasco	Fraser	King, Calif.
Brooks	Friedel	Kirwan
Broomfield	Fulton, Pa.	Kornegay
Brown, Calif.	Fulton, Tenn.	Kupferman
Brown, Mich.	Fuqua	Kyl
Burke, Mass.	Galifianakis	Kyros
Burton, Calif.	Gallagher	Landrum
Button	Garmatz	Leggett
Byrne, Pa.	Gathings	Long, Md.
Cahill	Gibbons	Lukens
Carter	Gilbert	McCarthy
Celler	Gonzalez	McDade
Cohelan	Gray	McDonald, Mich.
Conte	Green, Oreg.	McFall
Conyers	Green, Pa.	McMillan
Corbett	Gude	Macdonald, Mass.
Corman	Hagan	Machen
Culver	Halpern	Madden
Daddario	Hamilton	Mahon
Daniels	Hanna	Martin
Davis, Ga.	Hansen, Wash.	Mathias, Md.
de la Garza	Hardy	Matsunaga
Delaney	Harvey	Mayne
Diggs	Hathaway	Meskill
Dingell	Hawkins	Miller, Calif.
Donohue	Hays	Mills
Dowdy	Hechler, W. Va.	Minish
Downing	Helstoski	Mink
Dulski	Henderson	Monagan
Duncan	Hicks	Moore
Dwyer	Holifield	Moorhead
Morgan	Rhodes, Pa.	Stuckey
Morris, N. Mex.	Riegle	Sullivan
Morse, Mass.	Rivers	Taft
Moss	Roberts	Taylor
Multer	Rodino	Tenzer
Murphy, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.	Tiernan
Murphy, N.Y.	Rogers, Fla.	Tunney
Natcher	Ronan	Udall
Nedzi	Rooney, Pa.	Van Deerlin
Nichols	Rosenthal	Vanik
Nix	Rostenkowski	Vigorito
O'Hara, Ill.	Roush	Waggonner
O'Hara, Mich.	Roybal	Waldie
Olsen	Ryan	Walker
O'Neill, Mass.	Sandman	Wampler
Patman	St Germain	Watts
Patten	Saylor	White
Pepper	Scheuer	Whitener
Perkins	Schweiker	Whitten
Philbin	Schwengel	Widnall
Poage	Selden	Wilson, Charles H.
Pollock	Shipley	Wolff
Price, Ill.	Sikes	Wright
Pucinski	Sisk	Wylie
Randall	Skubitz	Wyman
Rees	Slack	Young
Reid, N.Y.	Stafford	Zablocki
Reifel	Staggers	Zwach
Resnick	Steed	
Reuss	Stephens	
	Stubblefield	

NAYS—128

Abbitt	Dole	Myers
Abernethy	Dorn	O'Neal, Ga.
Adair	Edwards, Ala.	Passman
Andrews, Ala.	Erlenborn	Pettis
Arends	Eshleman	Pickle
Ashbrook	Findley	Pirnie
Ashmore	Fisher	Poff
Baring	Ford, Gerald R.	Price, Tex.
Bates	Frelinghuysen	Quillen
Belcher	Gardner	Railsback
Bell	Goodell	Rarick
Bennett	Goodling	Reid, Ill.
Berry	Gross	Reinecke
Betts	Grover	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton	Gurney	Robison
Brinkley	Haley	Roth
Brown, Ohio	Hall	Roudebush
Broyhill, N.C.	Halleck	Rumsfeld
Broyhill, Va.	Hammer-schmidt	Satterfield
Buchanan	Hansen, Idaho	Schadeberg
Burke, Fla.	Hosmer	Scherle
Burleson	Hutchinson	Schneebeli
Bush	Jarman	Scott
Byrnes, Wis.	Keith	Shriver
Cabell	King, N.Y.	Smith, N.Y.
Casey	Kleppe	Smith, Okla.
Cederberg	Kuykendall	Snyder
Chamberlain	Laird	Springer
Clancy	Langen	Steiger, Ariz.
Clawson, Del	Latta	Steiger, Wis.
Cleveland	Lennon	Talcott
Collier	Lipscomb	Teague, Calif.
Colmer	MacGregor	Thomson, Wis.
Conable	Mailliard	Tuck
Cowger	Marsh	Utt
Cramer	Mathias, Calif.	Watson
Cunningham	May	Whalley
Curtis	Michel	Wiggins
Davis, Wis.	Miller, Ohio	Williams, Pa.
Delienback	Minshall	Wilson, Bob
Denney	Montgomery	Winn
Derwinski	Morton	Wydler
Dickinson		Zion

NOT VOTING—75

Anderson, Ill.	Gubser	Pelly
Andrews, N. Dak.	Haniey	Pike
Ayres	Harrison	Pool
Battin	Harsha	Pryor
Blackburn	Hébert	Purcell
Bolling	Heckler, Mass.	Quie
Bow	Herlong	Rooney, N.Y.
Bray	Holland	Ruppe
Brock	Horton	St. Onge
Brotzman	Ichord	Smith, Calif.
Burton, Utah	Jonas	Smith, Iowa
Carey	Jones, Mo.	Stanton
Clark	Kelly	Stratton
Clausen, Don H.	Kluczynski	Teague, Tex.
Dawson	Lloyd	Thompson, Ga.
Dent	Long, La.	Thompson, N.J.
Devine	McClory	Ullman
Dow	McClure	Vander Jagt
Evans, Colo.	McCulloch	Watkins
Fino	McEwen	Whalen
Flynt	Meeds	Williams, Miss.
Gettys	Mize	Willis
Giaimo	Mosher	Wyatt
Griffiths	Nelsen	Yates
	O'Konski	Younger
	Ottinger	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mosher for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. McClure against.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. McClory against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Watkins against.

Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Younger against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Devine.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Pryor with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Bow.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Pike with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Dow of New York with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Whalen.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Dawson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill—S. 953—to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 953

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1967;" the following: "not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1969; not in excess of $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970;".

SEC. 2. Section 16(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "This Act shall be carried out

only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 953 and insert the provisions of H.R. 1318, as passed, as follows:

"That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out the word 'and' the first time it appears therein and by inserting after the word '1967;' the words 'not in excess of $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968;'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 1318) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND THE WEEK OF JUNE 12, 1967

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the rest of this week and the schedule for next.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have completed the legislative business for the week and will ask to go over upon the announcement of the program.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day. There are no District bills. But we do have H.R. 7476, to authorize adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates, under an open rule, with 2 hours of debate.

Tuesday, the Department of Defense Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1968.

Wednesday is Flag Day. Appropriate ceremonies will be conducted in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Also on Wednesday we have H.R. 2082, to authorize travel, transportation, and education allowances to members of the Armed Forces for dependents' schooling, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate.

On Thursday we have H.R. 10480, to prohibit desecration of the flag. This is subject to a rule being granted.

The announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

I would like to say for the information of the House that we expect the conference report on the draft bill and maybe others.

I must advise the House that there is certainly a possibility, and a strong probability, that the bill involving the railroad situation may come out of committee, and if it does, of course, it will be programed under our reservation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would it have a priority?

Mr. ALBERT. It would have a high-ranking priority.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 123 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

AID AND ASSISTANCE FOR THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL

(Mr. GALLAGHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, songs will be sung and tales told of the heroic nation of Israel and its people who live in the cradle of reason and hope, yet who cherish freedom so much they could accept nothing less. It is the reenactment of the battle of David and Goliath and the entire free world stands thrilled.

With the acceptance of the cease-fire by Egypt, Israel appears on the verge of a great accomplishment. She has answered the continued aggressions of the Arab nations with an astounding, almost Biblical victory over them. She has demonstrated to them that if they refuse to accept the peaceful solutions to world problems as a rule of international life then she too can fight back, that she can answer force with force. That she can do more than survive.

It is unfortunate for wars to occur. It is not good to see people dying, Jews or Arabs, South Vietnamese or North Vietnamese, Americans—but when international law and order are violated by one nation, as President Nasser's call of a holy war by Arab nations against Israel, then one can resist or surrender: Israel chose to resist.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to look ahead. Israel while conducting a brilliant campaign nevertheless has incurred great losses. The loss of life can never be replaced but on her other losses she can be helped. She should be helped and helped immediately.

I have suggested to the executive branch that immediate economic assurance be made available to Israel. As a result I have been informed that we will shortly make available to Israel both economic assistance and medical and food supplies. This will not come out of the Foreign Assistance Act. For Israel gets no foreign aid. On Monday we will begin the mark up of the new foreign aid bill. At that time I intend to offer amendments which will give the President authorization to assist Israel out of the foreign aid bill in accordance with her requirements to return to normalcy after the drastic dislocation of her economy forced on her by the war.

When one considers the dangers of world war III posed by Nasser, the dilemma in which not only the United States was in, but the entire world on the waterway issue alone, I think it can be quickly understood that the free world owes a great debt to Israel.

I hope we will move quickly to assist her. I hope too that the peace that follows will be a lasting peace. Israel has proved that she is here to stay. Perhaps the best witness to give testimony to this fact is Mr. Nasser.

Mr. Speaker, as you know last year I represented our country at the opening of the Israel Parliament, the Knesset. As I was leaving Israel I was reminded of one of Solomon's songs. I mentioned it then and as the war heads for a cease-fire and guns grow cool, I would like to repeat it now:

For, lo, the winter is past,
The Rain is over and gone,
The flowers appear on the earth,
The time of the singing of birds is come,
And the voice of the turtle-dove is heard on our land.

Let us pray that the voice of the turtle-dove will soon be heard again in Israel. Let us hope it will be heard in Vietnam, in our land and in every land by all men.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 13, 1967
For actions of June 12, 1967
90th-1st; No. 91

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriations.....1
Alaska.....6
Appropriations.....1,19
Balance of payments.....42
Conservation.....16,37
Cotton.....35
Cropland restoration....58
Data processing.....25
Education.....28
Electrification....2,32,43
Extension service.....52
Farm loans.....4
Farm program.....58
[illegible]cal policy.....30
Flag.....20
Flood insurance.....10
Food.....7,13,36
Food stamps.....7
Foreign aid.....23,40,53
Foreign trade 3,12,26,41,46,56
Forest Service.....1
Free enterprise.....24
Health.....21
Holiday.....57
Information.....25,46,54
Insecticides.....34
Job Corps.....39
Lands.....44
Legislative reorganization 5,31,47
Legislative program.....17
Livestock exports.....3,46
Mexican American affairs.....27
Mink imports.....26,41,56
Opinion poll.....38
Personnel.....9,50
Population.....55
Poverty.....14,33
Program evaluation.....51
Public debt.....29
Recess.....17
Reclamation.....22
Recreation.....45
Reports.....8
Research.....21,34
Retirement.....9
Safety.....48
Scenic rivers.....11
Seed.....37
Selective service.....18
Taxation.....15
Water pollution.....49
Water restoration.....58
World hunger.....13,36

HIGHLIGHTS: See page 6

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9029, the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill (including Forest Service), and acted on amendments in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S8027-30

   Sen. Holland announced postponement of committee markup of the agricultural appropriation bill until the Dodd resolution is disposed of. p. S7957

2. ELECTRIFICATION. Received from the Federal Power Commission the proposed Electric Power Reliability Act of 1967; to Commerce Committee. p. S7941

3. LIVESTOCK EXPORTS. The Small Business Committee submitted a report, "Expansion of Livestock Exports" (S. Rept. 343). pp. S7945-7

4. FARM LOANS. Sen. Nelson spoke in support of his bill S. 1567, to provide long-term, low-interest loans to young men starting a career in agriculture, and announced additional cosponsors of the bill. pp. S8037-8

   Additional cosponsors were announced to S. 1504 and S. 1567, to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act. p. S7955

5. LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION. Agreed to, without amendment, S. Con. Res. 32, to continue the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress through December 31, 1967. p. S7938

   Agreed to, as reported, S. Res. 133, to continue the Senate Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress through December 31, 1967.

6. ALASKA. Passed as reported S. 1281, to authorize appropriations to carry out activities of Federal committees for development planning in Alaska. pp. S7939-40

   The Rules and Administration Committee reported a resolution to print a report, "Mineral and Water Resources of Alaska." p. S7940

7. FOOD STAMPS. Senate conferees were appointed on S. 953, to continue the Food Stamp Program. House conferees have not yet been appointed. p. S8021

8. REPORTS. Received the annual reports of the Treasury Department and the General Accounting Office. p. S7941

9. PERSONNEL. Received from the Civil Service Commission a proposed bill to amend "subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code" on "civil service retirement"; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. S7941

10. FLOOD INSURANCE. Received a Fla. Legislature resolution favoring flood-insurance legislation. pp. S7943-4

11. SCENIC RIVERS. Received a Fla. Legislature resolution opposing inclusion of the Suwanee River in scenic-rivers legislation. p. S7944

12. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Kuchel inserted his statement on expansion of foreign trade before a Chamber of Commerce seminar. pp. S7960-1

13. FOOD. Sen. McGovern inserted R. C. Liebenow's statement on "Agribusiness and the war against hunger." pp. S7980-2

   Sen. Clark inserted C. I. Schottland's article, "The Hungry Can't Wait." pp. S8075-6

14. POVERTY. Several Senators debated the poverty program. pp. S7984-5, S7989-92, S7994, S8025-6, S8071-4

15. TAXATION. Sen. McCarthy inserted a statement by Gardner Ackley on possibilities for tax incentives to encourage economic activity. pp. S7995-7

page 4 of the committee report on the pending bill, S. 1030, as amended.

The Foreign Relations Committee has considered the criticisms which have been leveled against the IMG program. These are of two general types: First, that the program is an unjustified subsidy for the U.S. publishing industry; and second, that it generates foreign currencies in excess of U.S. needs and over which the United States has only minimal control. In simple terms, the committee disagrees with the first and has amended the bill to meet the second.

The purpose of the IMG program is to make U.S. informational and educational materials available in countries where foreign exchange restrictions would otherwise keep them out. As much as 90 percent of the materials involved are textbooks, mainly scientific and technical works. The alternatives to IMG are that: (1) these materials would not be available at all in the countries where IMG currently operates—Afghanistan, Guinea, Korea, Poland, Turkey, Vietnam, and Yugoslavia; (2) they would be supplied from non-U.S. sources—which, in the case of several of the countries, probably means Soviet sources; or (3) they would be supplied by USIA or AID, in which case the Treasury would have to pay the full cost.

It seems to the committee clear that it is in the national interest for these materials to be available in the countries listed—as well as, hopefully, in some others. IMG is a device for achieving this objective at minimum cost and in a way—through commercial channels—which is politically acceptable abroad.

It should be emphasized that the issuance of informational media guaranties is not automatic. Books and other items are eligible only if USIA finds that they make a positive contribution to the achievement of U.S. objectives.

With respect to the second criticism of the program mentioned above—namely, the generation and management of foreign currencies—the committee has amended the bill to provide that these are henceforth to be available for such use as Congress decides. There will not, therefore, be a repetition of some situations which have occurred in the past when large balances of foreign currencies were available under international agreements for only limited uses. The committee recognizes that this amendment does not meet the general problem of excess foreign currency holdings in a few countries, but that problem arises from programs of the U.S. Government other than IMG. Indeed, IMG in recent years has contributed very little to it.

Further, the committee believes that the shift in financing from Treasury borrowing to a revolving fund replenished from time to time by appropriations will make it easier for Congress to oversee the program.

Finally, the committee urges the Senate to act on this bill promptly. IMG has had no appropriations for the past 3 fiscal years, during which it has operated on the residue of its Treasury borrowing authority. No further obligations are being incurred, and in the absence of new legislation the program will be ended this fiscal year. Action on this bill should, accordingly, be completed by the Congress as soon as possible.

I should like to say a word about the alleged subsidy which this bill is said to create. Actually, in my opinion, it is hardly a subsidy at all. What happens is that American book publishers undertake to increase their foreign sales. If those foreign sales went to a hard currency country, such as West Germany, England, or France, the publishers would be engaging in a profit or loss undertaking in those countries. They would convert into dollars the francs or the pounds sterling or the German marks that they got from the undertaking, and they would either make a profit or suffer a loss. But when they go into a soft currency country, they are confronted immediately with a loss no matter what happens, unless they can get their soft currency redeemed for dollars. So it is obvious that no book publisher in his right mind, who, after all, is in business for a profit, is going to conduct operations in the very country where these American materials are most needed when he knows perfectly well that because of the currency situation, he is going to lose his shirt the minute he walks in.

For that reason, if we want these materials available to the general public in the other countries, not just through a USIS information library, but on a commercial basis, sold to those people in the other countries which want them, we must subsidize this work or we must have the USIA do it at 100-percent Government expense, or we will have to surrender the market to the Soviet Union.

It seems to me that of all those alternatives, this bill presents by far the best way of handling the matter.

It is true, as developed in the colloquy between the Senator from Lousiana and I, that this bill was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations by a vote of 14 to 3, at the request of the President of the United States, with the approval of the USIA, and with the approval of the State Department and the Department of Commerce, to overrule what the Committee on Appropriations has been doing in this area for the last several years.

The Senate will have an opportunity to vote on this policy issue a little later on. I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. President, unless others wish to speak, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967 which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out the word "and" the first time it appears therein and by inserting after the word "1967;" the words "not in excess of $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968;".

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to S. 953 and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. BOGGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS NOW ON DEPOSIT TO THE CREDIT OF THE CHEYENNE-ARAPAHO TRIBES OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, for myself and my senior colleague [Mr. MONRONEY] I introduce, for appropriate reference, at the request of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Business Committee, a bill to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the tribes.

The bill calls for one-half million dollars to be held in trust for an educational scholarship fund for the members of the tribes with the remainder of the judgment to be distributed per capita. By way of background information, the tribal business committee is presently in the process of selecting a bank to act as trustee under the provisions of section 2 and section 3(c) of the proposed act. After the trustee is selected, I am advised that the business committee plans to have the actual trust agreements drafted and possibly executed prior to committee hearings on the bill so that they may be available to the committee to become a part of the record at the hearings.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD council resolution No. 358–S15 by which the Business Committee of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma approved and recommended the bill I am today introducing on their behalf, and that the bill also may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. President, the Cheyennes and Arapahoes have waited long enough for these funds which are rightfully theirs, and I certainly hope this bill will be considered and passed as rapidly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and council resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1933) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1933

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to distribute and expend the funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma that were appropriated by the Act of October 31, 1965 (79 Stat. 1133), in satisfaction of the settlement and compromise of claims of said tribes against

the United States in the Indian Claims Commission in dockets numbered 329A and 329B, together with the interest accured thereon, as herein provided.

SEC. 2. $500,000 of said funds shall be held in trust for the purpose of providing education and scholarships for members of said tribes pursuant to a trust agreement to be made and entered into by and between said tribes, as grantor, and a national banking association located in the State of Oklahoma, as trustee which trust agreement shall be authorized and approved by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall distribute remaining funds per capita to all persons alive on the date of this Act whose names appear on the membership roll of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma or who, on the date of this Act, were eligible for membership, hereinafter referred to as "enrollees", as follows:

(a) a share payable to an enrollee not less than twenty-one years of age shall be paid direct inone payment to such enrollee, except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section;

(b) a share payable to an enrollee dying after the date of this Act shall be distributed to his heirs or legatees upon the filing of proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, whose findings and determinations upon such proof shall be final and conclusive; *Provided,* That if a share of such deceased enrollee, or a portion thereof, is payable to an heir or legatee under twenty-one years of age or under legal disability, the same shall be paid and held in trust pursuant to subsection (c) of this section;

(c) a share or proportional share payable to an enrollee or person under twenty-one years of age or to an enrollee or person under legal disability shall be paid and held in trust for such enrollee or person pursuant to a trust agreement to be made and entered into by and between the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, as grantor, and a national banking association located in the State of Oklahoma, as trustee, which trust agreement shall be authorized and approved by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. (a) All claims for per capita shares, whether by a living enrollee or by the heirs or legatees of a deceased enrollee, shall be filed with the Area Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Anadarko, Oklahoma, not later than three years from the date of approval of this Act. Thereafter, all claims and the right to file same shall be forever barred and the unclaimed shares shall revert to the tribes.

(b) Tribal funds that revert to the tribes pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, including interest and income therefrom, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body.

SEC. 5. No part of any funds distributed or held in trust under the provisions of this Act shall be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

SEC. 6. Funds distributed and payments made under this Act shall not be held to be "other income and resources", as that term is used in sections 2(a)(10)(A), 402(a)(7), 1002(a)(8), and 1402(a)(8) of the Social Security Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 302(a)(10)(A), 602(a)(7), 1202(a)(8), and 1352(a)(8)).

SEC. 7. (a) All costs incident to making the payments authorized by this Act, including the costs of payment roll preparation and such sums as may be required to distribute said funds, shall be paid by appropriate withdrawals from the judgment fund and interest on the judgment fund, using the interest fund first.

(b) In the event that the sum of money reserved by the Secretary of the Interior to pay the costs of distributing said funds exceeds the amount actually necessary to accomplish this purpose, the money remaining shall revert to the tribes and may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized and approved by the tribal governing body.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The council resolution, presented by Mr. HARRIS, is as follows:

COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 358–S15 OF THE CHEYENNE-ARAPAHO TRIBES OF OKLAHOMA

Whereas an appropriation of funds to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma has been made by the Congress of the United States, and,

Whereas the Business Committee of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma has deliberated and studied at length the proper disposition of said funds, and,

Whereas a proposed Act has been approved by said Business Committee for submission to the Congress of the United States setting forth the desired disposition of said funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Business Committee of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma does hereby adopt, ratify, approve and recommend the attached proposed Act which is incorporated by reference as if fully set out herein; and be it further

Resolved, That legal counsel for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma be and is hereby authorized and directed to forward said attached proposed Act and this Resolution to appropriate members of the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation for introduction and passage by the Congress of the United States and subsequent enactment into law.

LAWRENCE H. HART, *Chairman.*

Attest:

JUANITA L. LEARNED, *Secretary.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) continuing the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

SECURITY COUNCIL DEBATE ON VIETNAM SHOULD BE WELCOME

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, although the Security Council is now immersed in the matter of the critical, delicate, and dangerous situation in the Middle East and is giving it priority in consideration—as it should—I would express the hope that the matter of Vietnam would not be avoided, stalled, or held up when the pending Mideast situation is resolved.

Although the conflict in Vietnam races on, gathering a momentum which threatens the peace of the entire world, the United Nations machinery for applying the brakes remains idle. There appears to be a reluctance to undertake an open international debate on Vietnam. There appears to be a fear that the United Nations would be used as a propaganda forum, or that there would be criticism which would embarrass the United States or other nations, or that the debate would exacerbate existing tension. These fears are well founded but misplaced.

To be sure, the debate of Vietnam may be hostile and acrimonious. Thin skins may bruise and ears may burn by such a debate. But an escalation of words on Vietnam ought not to alarm; it is the escalation of war which gives deepening cause for concern.

Open debate in the Security Council is something the world should welcome, not fear. It is the trading of words in place of the exchange of blows among all the parties concerned that a rational peace will be obtained. The Security Council offers a setting in which to begin the former. The Cochairmen of the Geneva Conference—the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union—are permanent member states. Two members of the Geneva International Control Commission on Indochina—India and Canada—are also members of the Security Council. The third member, Poland, a U.N. member, could be invited to participate in the discussion, along with the People's Republic of China, South Vietnam, the National Liberation Front, North Vietnam, and any other government or group whose presence might be of some relevance to negotiations. To be sure, refusals to attend may be forthcoming, but all should be invited and the invitations should be left open.

The United States could take an immediate initiative, once the Mideast matter is out of the way, in bringing about this vitally needed discussion of the subject in the Security Council. More than a year ago the United States took a step in this direction and succeeded in getting the question placed on the Security Council's agenda. However, the United States did not ask for full debate at that time, nor did it press for a vote.

Whatever the reason then for the stillborn initiative, the present circumstances would appear to urge another try with greater persistence. The overall picture has changed from a year ago. Many other initiatives have been tried and have failed in the interim; secret diplomacy has been singularly ineffective. The U.N. Secretary General in his personal capacity has tried without success.

A full and open discussion before the U.N. is clearly warranted. If for no other reason, it is warranted in an effort to get clearly on the record a position of the various attitudes which are involved in this conflict. Certainly, there is likely to be criticism directed against us, as against all participants, but it is better to discuss this criticism openly than to ignore it or pretend it does not exist. The possibilities of criticism in no way dilutes the responsibility for finding a satisfactory basis for ending the conflict.

It would be my hope that the Security Council will soon extend a formal and unequivocal invitation to all involved in Vietnam to participate in a discussion of the situation. It would be my further hope that all those invited would attend and present their views. Whether or not they do, however, at least the Security Council, by its invitation, would have begun to face up to the responsibility which is composed by Vietnam. At least

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 19, 1967
For actions of June 16, 1967
90th-1st; No. 95

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....9
Alaska natives.....11
Appropriations.....8,29
Banking.....18
Conservation.....7
Cosponsors.....13
Creative federalism.....15
Credit.....10,20
Dairy imports.....26,30
Debt limit.....1,7,24
Electrification.....22,32
Farm credit.....10
Fire research.....17
Flag.....7,25
Food for India.....6
Food stamp.....2
Foreign affairs.....18
Foreign aid.....16
Foreign trade..19,26,30,33
Health.....30
Highway beautification...4
Intergovernmental relations.....11
Lands.....31
Legislative program.....7
Life insurance.....28
Loans.....13
Manpower.....23
Marketing.....27
Meat inspection.....5
Mink imports.....33
Personnel.....28
Postal rates.....34
Purchasing.....21
Reclamation.....22
Textiles.....13
Travel.....35
Water.....12
Water pollution.....3,14

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported public debt limit increase bill.

HOUSE

1. DEBT LIMIT. The Ways and Means Committee reported H. R. 10867, to increase the public debt limit (H. Rept. 368). p. H7395

2. FOOD STAMP. Conferees were appointed on S. 953, to continue the food stamp program. Senate conferees have been appointed. pp. H7375-6

3. WATER POLLUTION. Rep. Cramer criticized the administration of the water pollution control program and inserted an article, "Congress Ordered Fast Action, But--Pollution Agency Trickles Along." pp. H7376-7

4. HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION. Rep. Cramer criticized the administration of the highway beautification program. pp. H7377-8

5. MEAT INSPECTION. Rep. Everett commended the administration's proposal to amend the Meat Inspection Act, "through which the inspection of our meat supply would be greatly strengthened and the consumer better protected."

6. FOOD FOR INDIA. Rep. Resnick criticized India's Prime Minister Gandhi's remark that "India is not getting aid without pressure," and stated that it is time we stopped "inflicting" our aid upon India. pp. H7391-2

7. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Boggs announced that on Mon. the House will have the Consent Calendar and five suspensions including H. R. 480, extending the act relating to the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl, and H. R. 482, authorizing an increase in fee for migratory bird hunting stamp; on Tues., the Private Calendar, followed by the conference report on the draft bill, and H. R. 10480, to prohibit desecration of the flag; and on Wed. the public debt limit increase bill. p. H7374

8. APPROPRIATIONS. H. R. 10738, the Defense appropriation bill recently passed by the House contains a provision requiring the procurement of U. S. produced food, clothing, cotton, woven silk or woven silk blends, spun silk yarn, or wool except to the extent that (1) satisfactory quality or quanity cannot be procured when needed at U.S. market prices and (2) procurements outside the U.S. in support of combat operations.

9. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 19. p. H7395

SENATE

10. FARM CREDIT. Sen. Ellender inserted his speech on the farm credit system and stated, "The Federal land bank system is one of the most successful creations of the Federal Government, and has served our farmers and the Nation well over the years." pp. S8360-2

11. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Sen. Scott inserted several letters from various State Governors commenting favorably on S 799, the proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967. pp. S8362-5

12. WATER. Sen. Moss inserted an article, "The Hard Facts of Colorado River," and stated, "It becomes more evident each day that there is simply not enough water in the Colorado River to meet the compact apportionments to the Upper and Lower Basin States, and that we cannot authorize the central Arizona project, or any other large project until we can find new sources of water." pp. S8370-

13. COSPONSORS. Sen. Mondale was added as a cosponsor to S. 1642, the proposed Rural Recreation and Industrial Development Loan Act of 1967; and Sen. Smith was added as a cosponsor to S. 1796, to impose quotas on the importation of certain textiles. pp. S8346-7

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. WATER POLLUTION. Rep. Griffin inserted an article, "Pollution Key Seen In Canadian Rivers", which offers a plan which could assist Canada and the U. S. to meet common problems of water levels, water pollution, and conservation. pp. A3063-4

15. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Ullman commending and inserting an address which "deals with specific ways that officials at all levels are beginning to develop a more effective working partnership, which in essence is the paramount goal of creative federalism." pp. A3080-2

themselves in a state of permanent war against Israel. Three times since her difficult birth in 1948, Israel has shown the ability in such circumstances to repulse aggressive incursions, as she did so heroically last week.

Israel has neither the means nor the will to destroy her Arab neighbors. One need only speculate in horror about what might have occurred had the military balance tilted the other way. Israel's strength and determination saved the situation. Now an enduring peace must be constructed.

The Arab States believe that the longer they delay meaningful negotiations, the greater will become the pressure for Israel to accept something close to the status quo ante. In 1956 Israel bowed to diplomatic pressure in exchange for promised diplomatic guarantees and returned to her 1949 frontiers, only to have the use of the Suez Canal denied to her, border harassment continue, and finally, when Nasser felt strong enough, the Gulf of Aqaba blocked and the call of "holy war" raised against her.

The gallant nation of Israel must never be so threatened again.

The United States, as a world power and as a friend of Israel, has an historic opportunity to use its influence toward achieving a permanent settlement. We had this chance in 1949; we had it in 1957; if we pass it up in 1967, in all likelihood we shall be confronted with another Middle Eastern war in 1977, when resentments are deeper and weapons stronger.

In this era of cold war there have been too many armistice agreements and too few settlements.

Mr. Speaker, the proceedings of the United Nations during the past weeks were cause for grave disappointment. The U.N. emergency force was withdrawn from the Gaza strip and Sharm el-Sheikh without consultation and with most serious consequences. The Security Council debates consisted of the hurling of charges and countercharges, the venting of anger, with little cooperative diplomacy.

Nevertheless, let us not forget that the existence of the United Nations provided the vehicle for an early cease-fire, that Syrian and Israel commanders came to agreement in United Nations headquarters in Quineitera, and that in this atmosphere of mutual hostility and suspicion the United Nations aegis still offers a hope for the initiation of direct negotiations.

This crisis has again demonstrated that the United Nations cannot play a useful role unless it is supported by the great powers.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union must be made to realize that a settlement in the Middle East is in the Soviet interest as well as in the interest of world peace. The Soviets made a grave tactical and diplomatic blunder when they encouraged Nasser's designs. It is deplorable that the Soviets have continued on a dangerous course, risking a wider war. They must cease to supply arms to the Arab nations.

If a stable and peaceful Middle East is in the interest of ourselves and the Soviet Union, it is certainly in the interest of the principals. Political hatreds have obstructed the peaceful development of the waters of the Jordan. A million Arabs are in a state of semipermanent homelessness and hopelessness because of political hatreds. Poor countries have had to devote a burdensome portion of their resources to armaments, and each spiral of armaments has generated a new cycle of hatreds.

Mr. Speaker, since the partition agreement of 1947, Israel has been encircled by hostile neighbors.

Her fighting spirit has been forged through 20 years of a continuing struggle for survival as she has been subjected to a steady campaign against her very existence. The Arab States have done everything in their power militarily, politically, and diplomatically to destroy Israel. In defiance of international treaty obligations and of the Security Council resolution of 1951, Israel shipping has been denied the use of the Suez Canal; Arab States boycott companies which do business with Israel and ships which call at Israel ports. For 20 years Israel has lived with commando raids and terrorists acts knowing that only her strength prevented her destruction.

The Arab States are so bent on destroying Israel that they have even undertaken acts contrary to their own self-interest.

One and three-tenths million refugees are deliberately kept in a state of degradation and agitation because of the promise that they will one day return to Palestine. To the half million who have never seen Israel, home is the refugee camp; and resettlement is not accomplished. Refugee commando groups, such as the "Palestine Liberation Army," have been created.

In 1955 a plan to develop cooperatively the waters of the Jordan, which was agreed to by Israel and Arab technicians, was rejected by the Arab governments, only to spite Israel. In 1964 an Arab summit meeting sought to divert the Jordan, which would have retarded both Israeli and Arab development.

Mr. Speaker, if the hatreds, resentments, terrorism, and acts of both economic and military warfare of the past 20 years are to cease once and for all, then there must be direct negotiations between the Arab States and Israel. The details of a settlement are the responsibility of the parties, but the United States would be abdicating its responsibility if it did not use its influence to encouraging negotiations to begin.

As long as Israel feels that maintenance of her present positions is essential to her security, it is not reasonable to expect Israel to relinquish whatever territory she occupied at the time of the cease-fire until a peace settlement is achieved.

In order to achieve a just and enduring peace in the Middle East, there are certain objectives which must be met.

The most fundamental, and the key to any settlement, is the acceptance by the Arab nations of the reality of the existence of Israel. As Abba Eban said before the United Nations on June 6:

> The first of these principles surely must be the acceptance of Israel's Statehood and the total elimination of the fiction of its non-existence. It would seem to me that after 3,000 years the time has arrived to accept Israel's nationhood as a fact. Here is the only State in the international community which has the same territory, speaks the same language and upholds the same faith as it did 3,000 years ago.
>
> A much more conscious and uninhibited acceptance of Israel's Statehood is an axiom requiring no demonstration. There will never be a Middle East without an independent and sovereign State of Israel in its midst.

Second, Israel must have access to international waterways. The closing of the Gulf of Aqaba was the act of aggression which precipitated the recent conflict. The right of innocent passage through the Strait of Tiran must be maintained. Also Israel must not be denied free transit through the Suez Canal. The right to use the Suez was guaranteed to Israel long ago, yet the promises have not been carried out. There must be an end to blockades and boycotts which interfere with peaceful commerce.

A peace settlement must guarantee the borders of Israel so that Israel will no longer be confronted with the infiltration of commandos, the shelling of settlements and the massing of invasion forces. The United States, the Soviet Union, and other nations must help both within and without the United Nations to guarantee the territorial integrity of Israel.

The Arab refugee question has persisted for years. Now is the time to resolve it. In the past Israel has offered compensation, but the Arab States have preferred to keep the refugee camps as a political issue rather than absorbing the refugees into the local economy. The United States, which has contributed the most to UNRRA, should insist that an effective plan be formulated for resettlement and compensation.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity is at hand to resolve the problems which have festered for so long and to achieve lasting stability in the Middle East. This will require an end to the arms race and the concomitant tensions to which the Soviets have constantly contributed. It will require the cooperation of the great powers. It will require a long range economic development concept for the entire region. In the final analysis, it will require a willingness on the part of the Arab States to live in peace—and that is all that Israel has ever asked—the right to live in peace. If the severe suffering and deprivation of the past 20 years is to be overcome, then this historic opportunity for a lasting peace must not be allowed to escape us.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES TO S. 953, AMENDING FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 953) an act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs.

POAGE, GATHINGS, STUBBLEFIELD, BELCHER, and TEAGUE of California.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION: AN AWARD FOR THE WORST ADMINISTERED FEDERAL AGENCY OF FISCAL YEAR 1967?

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 25 and 26 of this year, the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the House Committee on Public Works, the committee on which I have the privilege of serving as the ranking minority member, held hearings on the progress of the Federal water pollution control program and its administration or lack thereof by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration—FWPCA—an agency established in the Water Quality Act of 1965 within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—HEW—which agency was then abruptly transferred to the Department of the Interior by the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966.

The Federal water pollution control program, those who favored the reorganization argued, had been plagued for some time by the lack of priority given to it within the Public Health Service. The 1965 act established the FWPCA as a separate agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to give it the organizational status which the committee and the Congress felt were required to effectively carry out the important Federal water pollution control effort.

But without even consulting the members of the committee which has legislative jurisdiction over this all-important program, the President of the United States shot up to Congress a reorganization plan, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966, which, when effectuated, transferred the FWPCA from HEW to Interior.

During consideration in Congress of that reorganization plan, I and many other Members of Congress expressed serious concern over the possible effects this transfer could have on the overall administration of the program. We had thought, in setting up the FWPCA in the 1965 act, that everything was alright and that the program could then be administered smoothly and with adequate organizational status. Yet the President was determined to have still another agency-shaking transfer, and the reorganization plan was put into effect. This was done despite our cries that the FWPCA was going to lose competent personnel in this field where competent personnel is hard to come by. But "Oh, no!", said the administration spokesmen. We were assured by them in testimony before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations that everything was going to be rosy with the transfer, and that no one in FWPCA was discontent with the transfer, that the program would suffer absolutely no loss in effectiveness or efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, the testimony presented by the administration witnesses before the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors several weeks ago in response to inquiries by the subcommittee members surely reveals that the administration of this program is suffering—and suffering very badly. Some 60 percent of the PHS personnel are no longer with the agency.

In my seven terms in Congress and on the Committee on Public Works, I have never known of a Federal program of such importance as this one, and in which the administration has pushed so hard for "emergency" congressional increased authorization, being so badly administered. Perhaps it is not so much that the FWPCA heirarchy is badly administering the program as it is that they just are not administering period. It goes far beyond the shakeup which can naturally be expected by transferring an agency from one department to another. It is something much more than this.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Congress that has acted decisively on Federal water pollution control legislation on many occasions that something is very, very wrong with the administration of this program, And I am not alone in this opinion. I believe I am joined in it by many of my colleagues on the committee and in the Congress, by countless State and local administrators, by engineering consultants in this complex field, and even by publications which concern themselves with water resources management.

On April 27, I inserted in the RECORD, on pages H4789 to H4790 thereof, an article from the December 8, 1966, issue of the Engineering News-Record, a most respected professional publication. That article showed the gross inefficiency in the administration of the program, in the area of construction of sewage treatment works.

Mr. Speaker, May 10 marked the anniversary of the effectuation of the transfer required by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966. There were not any celebrations in the Nation that day on the effectiveness of FWPCA's first year under Interior. In my opinion, the progress of the program under FWPCA is little further along today than it was when reorganized last year. The agency itself is more poorly staffed and more organized than it was on May 10, 1966.

The hearings before the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors bear out everything that I am saying here today.

To further point out my contentions here today, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks at this point, an article from the Engineering News-Record of Thursday, May 4, entitled "Congress Ordered Fast Action, But—Pollution Agency Trickles Along." This article well points out the sorry state of affairs down at FWPCA.

As the article's opening paragraph points out:

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) marks its first year in the Department of Interior next week, But in the words of one bitter official "there probably won't be a party because I doubt if we could organize one."

No one could have said it better than that, Mr. Speaker.

After asking for a $450 million authorization in fiscal year 1968 the President only required $2 million, giving it low priority, while increasing highway beautification from $80 million to $160 million, demonstration cities requested from about $100 to $615 million and OEO poverty by 25 percent.

This shows lack of reality in setting priorities.

This proves a downgrading of water pollution control.

This proves a downgrading of ongoing, proven, and necessary programs in order to finance new.

The article follows:

CONGRESS ORDERED FAST ACTION, BUT—POLLUTION AGENCY TRICKLES ALONG

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) marks its first year in the Department of Interior next week. But in the words of one bitter official "there probably won't be a party because I doubt if we could organize one."

Organization is a dirty word in the federal government's newest dirty water agency. Established by Congress 16 months ago as an arm of the U.S. Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, FWPCA no sooner got its feet on the ground than it was shifted to Interior on May 10, 1966, under a presidential organization plan.

Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall predicted great things: "1966 will be the year of action in water pollution control."

But most of the action during the past year has centered on getting organized and helping the states get their water quality standards ready before the July 1 deadline. Many of the agency's other activities have suffered as a result.

Personnel is still one of the agency's biggest headaches. Of 326 commissioned PHS officers asked to make the transfer to Interior, 165 decided they'd rather fight than switch. The gap they left is not yet entirely filled.

The job of assistant commissioner for facilities, which carries the responsibility of the construction grants part of the program, is vacant. Mrs. Aleda Evans, former administrative assistant to FWPCA Commissioner Jame M. Quigley, is temporarily serving as legislative liaison officer.

About 22 of the 29 top men in FWPCA are still listed as acting assistant commissioner or division chief, because their jobs were reviewed and changed after the shift and, according to Quigley: "It took forever for us to write up the jobs and submit the new job descriptions to the Civil Service for approval."

With or without full job titles, many of the top officials may need a road map to find their way to work. The agency is perched in two buildings on Indiana Ave. and will probably need space in a third soon. The main building (called a fleatrap by one staff member and a firetrap by another) is a rented beehive of activity; maintenance men plane door bottoms so they clear the rugs; telephone men roam about to keep phones and moving staff members together.

The construction grants division is at full staff, but acting division chief Thomas Ferry wishes it wasn't. His section was slated to have a roster of 195, but that was when the agency expected to have a total staff of 2,800. When Interior ordered a freeze at 2,100, he was told to level off at 165. Earl J. Anderson, acting assistant commissioner for technical programs admits his staff isn't organized and says he expects to replace lost PHS people "in about a year."

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued September 20, 1967
For actions of September 19, 1967
90th-1st; No. 147

CONTENTS

Accounting.....35
Appalachia.....14
Apples.....34
Appropriations.....2
Containers.....18
Cosponsors.....7
Dairy indemnity.....27
Data processing.....39
Education.....25
Employment.....17,38
Farm Bureau.....23
Farm loans.....9
Food stamps.....1
Foreign agricultural aid.7
Foreign aid.....7,10
Fruits and vegetables...18
Grain reserve.....24
Holidays.....30
Job Corps.....5
Lands.....16
Loans.....9,15
Marketing.....21,34
Mink imports.....33
Opinion poll.....31
Organization.....4
Personnel.....37
Poverty.....5,26
PPBS.....35
Public works.....36
Purchasing.....39
REA loans.....15
Reclamation.....13
Recreation.....20
Rural development.....3
Rural life.....22
Rural water.....28
Social security.....6,19
Taxation.....12,29,38
Textiles.....7,32
Water pollution.....8
Wildlife.....11

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to revised food stamp bill. House committee voted to report REA supplemental financing bill. Rep. Betts introduced and discussed bill to require status report on development of accounting systems to implement programming-budgeting systems.

SENATE

1. FOOD STAMP PROGRAM. Agreed to an amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 953, to authorize appropriations for the food stamp program. The revised bill authorizes $200 million for the fiscal year 1968 and $225 million for the fiscal year 1969 and provides that only appropriations made from the general fund of the Treasury for this specific purpose may be used to carry out the program. The House then concurred in the Senate amendment by a vote of 196 to 154. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S13245-6, H12120-3

2. APPROPRIATIONS. Continued consideration of H. R. 9960, the independant offices and HUD appropriation bill. pp. S13232-3, S13236-61

3. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Bennett urged the enactment of S. 2134, the proposed Rural Job Development Act of 1967. pp. S13214-5

4. ORGANIZATION. Sen. Pearson spoke in favor of S. 47, to create a Commission on the Operation of the Executive Branch, to study the organization and functioning of the Federal bureaucracy for a 2-year period and make recommendations to Congress. pp. S13172-4

5. POVERTY. Sen. Jackson submitted an amendment to S. 2388, the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, to continue the present policy in the administration of the Job Corps program under OEO. pp. S13179-80

6. SOCIAL SECURITY. Sen. Hartke urged enactment of H. R. 12080, the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1967, and submitted several amendments to this bill. pp. S13180-1

7. COSPONSORS. Sen. Miller spoke in favor of S. 1796, to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles, and added his and Sen. Bayh's name as cosponsors of this bill. p. S13181

Sens. Clark, Inouye, and Bayh were added as cosponsors to S. 2273, to promote interest and training in international agricultural assistance, and Sen. Burdick was added as a cosponsor to S. 2348, to provide for a Great Prairie Lakes Parkway in S. D. and N. D. p. S13181

8. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Dirksen inserted a series of articles and reports which point out "the peril to health and public safety involved in pollution of the Great Lakes." pp. S13181-13207

9. FARM LOANS. Sen. McGovern inserted an FHA report on activities in S. D. since the inception of the program through 1966. pp. S13210-1

10. FOREIGN AID. Sen. McGee inserted an article, "Topics: What Foreign Aid Can and Cannot Do." p. S13214

11. WILDLIFE. Sen. Yarborough spoke in favor of S. Con. Res. 41, to provide for the setting up of an international conference on conservation of wildlife, and inserted an article, "Hard-Pressed Species can Survive if Buyers Take Profit out of Killing." pp. S13223-4

12. TAX SHARING. Received a resolution favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a Federal tax sharing program. p. S13175

13. RECLAMATION. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved for full committee consideration H. R. 845, to authorize construction and operation of the Neb.-Midstate division, Mo. River Basin project, and S. 6, to authorize construction of the first stage of the Oahe unit, James Division, Mo. River Basin project, S. D. p. D824

HOUSE

14. APPALACHIA. Conferees were appointed in both Houses on S. 602, to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. pp. H12120, S13233-6

tinguished Senator from Maine and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. In our generation I do not know of any public servant who has rendered finer service than has General Hershey, the Director of the Selective Service System, and I would certainly consider most carefully any recommendation or suggestion he makes with regard to that Service. He is among the most competent people in Selective Service, where there are very competent officers.

I do feel, however, Mr. President, that this is not the place to consider promotions for officers in the armed services. This is a substantive matter. It is one that should receive the careful consideration of the Armed Services Committee. A bill can be introduced, and I am sure the Armed Services Committee will give it its most careful consideration to see that something will be done for officers who find themselves in the position in which these officers referred to here find themselves.

Mr. President, I hope that a bill will be introduced and that this matter will receive careful consideration. I feel its merits will be gone into at that time and whatever action is appropriate will be taken.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a letter sent to me from General Hershey, dated August 1.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1967.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I am pleased to confirm to you my enthusiastic endorsement of an amendment which you have under consideration which will, upon retirement, advance several officers of the Selective Service System in rank to their next highest grade with entitlement to retired pay at that grade. As I understand, the amendment which you have under consideration reads as follows:

"Any officer who has served with the Selective Service System in the position of a State Director of Selective Service or comparable executive position on the Staff of the Director of Selective Service for a period of fifteen (15) years will, upon retirement from active duty, be advanced in rank on the retired list to the next highest pay grade and be entitled to the retired pay of that grade as computed under appropriate provisions of law applicable to such person."

The officers affected by this amendment through their long tenure of outstanding service to their State and Nation richly deserve this recognition. It will serve, to some extent, to compensate for the lack of opportunity for career advancement assignment resultnig from their special assignment to the Selective Service System.

I certainly appreciate the efforts which you are making on behalf of these members of my staff and the Selective Service System, and assure you that in these efforts you have my wholehearted support.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will return to the consideration of the amendment on page 29.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Chair has sustained the point of order; has he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has sustained the point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unless there are some amendments to be offered by Members of the Senate on the Selective Service System, the next item——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Page 29.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Between the items for public buildings, under General Services Administration, and this item, there are other items involving GSA, to which, so far as I know, no amendments are to be offered.

The item for the Interstate Commerce Commission appears on page 22 of the bill.

With respect to the National Science Foundation, which is on the same page, it is my understanding that one or two Senators want to submit an amendment or amendments to the figure reported by the Senate committee. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] or other Senators may wish to offer an amendment to that item, but they are not present at this time, so we will pass that over, without prejudice.

Then there is the item with respect to the Renegotiation Board.

I am listing these so that any Senator will have an opportunity to submit an amendment to them.

Next is the Securities and Exchange Commission. Then the Selective Service System. The amounts there are approximately the same as last year. I read this in my earlier statement.

The Veterans' Administration has several items in the bill. This is by far the largest item in the bill. It needs a great deal of money for medical care and for fixed charges, insurance, and indemnities, and for many other purposes. The payments to the disabled and others involve several billion dollars.

The committee went over this item with a great deal of care, but most of the charges are fixed charges by law, and there is not much we can do about it. We added a small amount to the medical research and medical item.

The item for the Veterans' Administration on page 28 involves a great deal of paper in connection with sales of veterans housing, and FNMA has been handling that matter. With respect to participation sales, which have been authorized by Congress, that agency has a great deal of paper that can be released as certificates.

The Bureau of the Budget suggested that $850 million of other paper should be made available, with proper market conditions, under the Participation Sales Act. The House placed a ceiling of $300 million on that item; the Senate has restored the amount to $850 million. This is not an appropriation of any money whatsoever; it is merely a grant of authority to sell up to $850 million of Veterans' Administration participation certificates. In a nutshell, that is the purpose of this item.

The appropriation bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development will contain another item on the same subject.

Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who wishes to submit a conference report.

FOOD STAMP APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany S. 953]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
WALTER F. MONDALE,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD,
PAGE BELCHER,
CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 953 with an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1967;" the following: "not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;".

SEC. 2. Section 16(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose and in no event shall it be carried out with funds derived from permanent appropriations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the title of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the title of the Senate bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the amendment proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and also chairman of the Senate conferees would, in effect, continue the program for 2 years instead of the 3 years heretofore provided in the bill or the 1 year provided in the House bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the wording with reference to the funding of the program from year to year means that it must be funded out of general revenue appropriations, and not from a special fund, like the section 32 or other special funds earmarked for similar objectives?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

I may add that we are really adopting the Senate bill as it was passed by the Senate in June, except that instead of being a 3-year bill, it will be a 2-year bill.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 29, line 4.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to add, because I know there will be further discussion on this matter, the following:

The Participation Sales Act of 1966 was enacted May 24, 1966, as Public Law 89–429, and participation sales authorizations in varying amounts for the accounts of the Farmers Home Administration, the Office of Education—the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Veterans' Administration, and the Small Business Administration were included in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1967, together with an appropriation for the payment of insufficiencies.

For 1968, these authorizations are included in four appropriation bills. The large items, the VA and the FHA, of course, are in this bill. The Farmers Home Administration has been taken care of in the agricultural bill.

The Office of Education is in HEW, and that is now in conference. The Small Business Administration was handled by another committee. But the bulk of the amounts we are talking about is in the Veterans' Administration and HUD.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the committee amendment would strike the House of Representatives figure of $300 million and insert in lieu thereof $850 million, an increase of $550 million over and above the House figure.

This is an authorization for the sale of so-called participation certificates. This provides additional spending money for these agencies, exactly as would be done if we were to appropriate the $850 million directly. The difference is that by camouflaging this $550 million under the guise of selling our assets labeled as participation certificates it does not show up in the reported deficit at the end of the year, neither does it show up as a part of the national debt nor does it come under our national debt ceiling.

So the sole purpose of adopting this procedure to finance the cost of the Government is to give the administration a chance to deceive—and I emphasize the word "deceive"—the American taxpayers as to the true amount of the expenditures under this Great Society program.

In order to achieve that purpose these participation certificates are selling in the open market at an average interest rate of slightly more than six-tenths of 1 percent higher than Government bonds; yet they carry a guarantee on each of these participation certificates, pledging the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government toward not only repayment of the principal but also payment of all the interest. So they are just as solid and carry just as strong a guarantee from a financial standpoint as do our Government bonds themselves. Every banking institution in America knows that, but members of the general public, in buying securities, automatically picture a Government bond as being more solid than a security that carries some other name. The fact that these are named participation certificates and sold by the FHA confuses them. They do not read the fine language which say that these are just as solid and have just as much of the faith and credit of the U.S. Government behind them as do series E bonds or any other Government bonds.

In order to deceive the American taxpayer as to the extent of the deficit this back door method of raising money is being used, and to do that, as I have stated, we are paying an extra 0.6 percent in interest charges.

We already have outstanding a little more than $9 billion in this type of participation certificates. They are costing us today around $54 million a year more just to pay the additional interest charges on these bonds. This is above what it would cost if we had financed the cost of Government in the normal manner and as it has always been done heretofore. That $54 million is being paid for one purpose only, to give the administration a chance to deceive the American people as to how much it is spending under these programs.

This proposed $550 million alone will cost an additional $3.3 million—$3.3 million a year in interest charges above what it would cost if we struck this item out, appropriated the money in a normal manner, and sold Government bonds. I repeat, they will have the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government behind them.

Over in another section we have a request for an additional authorization to sell $2,385,000,000 participation certificates. If that is added, by adopting this bill as reported by the committee we will be providing $2,804,000,000, additional spending money for these agencies over and above the amount that was provided in the House bill. The only difference is that it will not be shown on the front page of the committee report, which shows the amount being appropriated for these agencies; it will not show in the deficit reported next June 30 by the administration; and it will not show in the national debt.

But the money will be spent. We will eventually have to pay it just the same as we woud any other Government bond; and on just this additional $2,804,000,000 provided for in the Senate bill it will cost $20 million a year extra interest for the life of the bonds, whether that be 5 or 6 years. If they are 5-year bonds we will be paying an additional $100 million to finance the Government in this manner for the sole purpose—and there is no other purpose for financing the Government in this manner—of deceiving the American people as to how much is being spent on these Great Society programs.

Under this procedure the expenditure will not show up anywhere in the budget. It can be used to defray the general cost of operating the Government in the same manner as any other appropriated funds.

This is a deceitful method for financing the Government. It is deceitful for such a proposal to be advanced by an administration which has said so much about advocating truth in lending and truth in packaging.

Then the administration comes along with this proposal. The White House has not been telling the American people the truth about the cost of government.

I think it is time that this administration started practicing what it preaches. Let the Senate be on notice that if we agree to the committee amendment, not only are we approving a procedure by which to deceive the American people but we are also approving a procedure to give to these agencies an extra $550 million above the amount that the House gave them, and that increased amount will not show up anywhere at all in the budget.

This is $550 million which the agency itself does not need.

This issue was debated in the House, and the RECORD shows that the Veterans' Administration will need an estimated $156,210,000 to take care of its direct loan programs. It will also need an approximate $20 million for administration expenses. That is a total of approximately $176 million that the House pro-

in the committee bill as section 12, and, briefly, it works to funnel Federal funds directly to those hospitals which, according to specified standards written into the bill, are determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to be critically overcrowded and unable to provide adequate service.

The important thing about the Partnership for Health bill, in my estimation, is that it carries out a philosophy we have been working toward since the enactment of public health laws back in 1936. Without question, the main thrust of the partnership for health bill, as originally introduced, was to consolidate many existing categories of grants, and allow the States greater flexibility and autonomy in incorporating Federal assistance into their own overall health programs. I believe this is a commendable goal. It shows that the health program has matured to the point that the States can initiate individual efforts, utilizing Federal assistance without overriding Federal control.

Part and parcel of the theory of autonomy in planning and action is that States must be able to exercise an effective control over the health programs within their area. If they are to provide a good public health program, they cannot have numerous uncontrolled public health programs flying about. Fragmentation of health planning and construction is what we are fighting at every turn, and whether we speak of the private or public sector of health, there is no denying that control and guidance is essential. There is no reasonably way a public health program can effectively supplement the private health sector without consolidation of public programs on the one hand, and coordination of State agencies with the private sector on the other.

Only last week, the House passed a bill perpetuating a fragmented program. The Appalachian Regional Development Act provided $28 million over and above the $41 million already approved for demonstration health projects. If there is such a pressing need for new health facilities and services in the Appalachian area, why not channel these funds through the existing Hill-Burton agencies to assure that their application is consistent with what is going on in the rest of the State?

The Hospital Emergency Assistance Act sets standards that are applied entirely in the discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. There is an incidental provision that applications for emergency assistance will be "coordinated" with existing health services available to the community, but this amounts to little more than a notification to the State agency of a project already set for implementation. In bypassing the priorities procedures that have worked so well under the Hill-Burton State agencies, section 12 is a step back rather than forward.

A Presidential Commission is studying the changes needed when Hill-Burton related programs come up for review next year. Emergency assistance of the type covered in section 12 is one of the subjects under consideration by the Commission. I believe that before we take a step which could do harm to the Hill-Burton program, and set a precedent for further splitting off of assistance programs, we should study the problem more carefully.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

I rise in sunpport of the Springer amendment. I cannot agree with the inclusion of section 12 in this otherwise commendable legislation.

This section was not included in the original bill. It was not the subject of complete and full hearings. It was not requested by administration witnesses.

This is an amendment to the Hill-Burton program for construction and modernization of hospitals, a program which has operated successfully for over 20 years. Hill-Burton program comes up for review and renewal early next year. Then is the time to go into questions of additional funds for hospital construction.

Under Hill-Burton, funds for construction of new hospitals and modernization of old hospitals, are provided by formula to the individual States. At the State level, the plans for implementing the program are made, here is where the priorities are set.

I can speak from some experience in having seen the program operate in my State of North Carolina. In North Carolina, the Medical Care Commission has the responsibility of submitting statewide plans and setting priorities. This commission has done a good job. It has been alert to the health needs of the State.

However, under section 12, the North Carolina Medical Care Commission will be completely bypassed in the allocation of funds. The secretary would make grants directly to individual hospitals and communities. Where are the guidelines? How will the Secretary decide where to allocate the funds? It should be clear that we are in danger of setting up a new program under Hill-Burton which would be complicated to administer, and open to "political log-rolling." In fact, with a new and untried program of this sort, Members of Congress would be under considerable pressure from back at home to obtain a portion of these funds. Let us not set up a program that could create confusion within a successful program, and where political manipulation could be possible.

I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER]. Keep in mind, that these funds were not requested by the administration and are not in the Federal budget. Next year will be the time to go into this program in greater detail.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend, my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, for his support of this amendment. He and I both know that in 1947 the General Assembly of North Carolina passed an act implementing the passage of the Hill-Burton Act in 1946, creating the North Carolina Medical Care Commission.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. LENNON. Under this proposal, under section 12, we would for all practical purposes bypass the State planning organizations that were created by the legislatures of the several States. Irrespective of what may be said by our friends from the large urban cities, those States have comparable medical care commissions or State planning bodies, and the applications should properly go through those State planning bodies in order that we can move forward under a very splendid program.

It is my urgent hope that the Members of this House will support—and I concede to my friend from the urban area of Chicago that there is need, and if this legislation could be drawn so that under section 12 these applications both for construction grants, and for planning for construction, and for staff and nurses, as well as general deficits, could go through the State planning bodies, we would see it a little bit differently, but it does not go through the State planning bodies or boards.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from North Carolina has stated the case correctly for North Carolina, where, of course, I have had the most experience with this program. The medical care commission has the responsibility for planning, and it is alert to the needs. It has done a good job.

I think this amendment is in order so that we can continue a program that has accomplished a good purpose and which should be continued.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I shall not take the 5 minutes.

Aside from the points that I think are very valid, that this section 12 bypasses the normal processes in the State, I have been sitting here just asking myself the question: Have we totally lost our minds?

The gentleman from New York is saying here that 150,000 people will go without medical help or proper care if the Federal Government does nothing about it. How foolish can we be?

Medical care is not our responsibility alone. I applaud the Hill-Burton program. If Members are so concerned about folks in their district not getting adequate medical care, why do they not do what we just did in Richland County, S.C., where the folks are the poorest—or, thanks to Mississippi—next to the poorest? Just a month ago our people decided we did not have adequate medical care, and we voted upon ourselves a $24 million bond issue.

What is wrong with us? We do not want to tell the American people and other folks that unless we pass this section 12, with $58 million—$40 million in grants and $18 million for loans—people are not going to have adequate care. How ridiculous can we be?

We have an orderly program. The President has not requested this.

Although they say it is a single shot proposition, we can rest assured that they will have 10 times as many appli-

cations the first year as funds available to care for them. They will never be able to stop, because if we give emergency help to New York we will have to give it to California and to Illinois, and we will have to give a little bit down South.

I say to my friends, consider the taxpayers.

If Members have such a drastic problem in their areas, what about asking the people to do something about it, as we just did in Richland County, S.C.?

Frankly, gentlemen, we not only have compassion for those who need medical help, but we are willing to put our money where our mouths are and not run up to Washington and try to get the Federal Government to take care of our problem.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6418) to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and expand the authorizations for grants for comprehensive health planning and services, to broaden and improve the authorization for research and demonstrations relating to the delivery of health services, to improve the performance of clinical laboratories, and to authorize cooperative activities between the Public Health Service hospitals and community facilities, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered, and on the Reuss amendment and on the Springer amendment to section 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 602, TO REVISE AND EXTEND THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965, AND TO AMEND TITLE V OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 602) to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, with House amendments thereto, insist upon the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FALLON, JONES of Alabama, WRIGHT, EDMONDSON, CRAMER, SCHWENGEL, and CLEVELAND.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 244 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 953, AMENDMENT OF FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. POAGE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 649)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD,
PAGE BELCHER,
CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
WALTER F. MONDALE,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, report that the conferees have been unable to agree.

W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD,
PAGE BELCHER,
CHARLES M. TEAGUE.
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

(For conference report, see proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the Senate amendments to the House amendment to S. 953, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House engrossed amendment insert:

"That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after 'June 30, 1967;' the following: 'not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;'.

"SEC. 2. Section 16(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose and in no event shall it be carried out with funds derived from permanent appropriations.'"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. POAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. POAGE moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment to S. 953.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I have opposed the extension of this bill for a longer period than 1 year, but it seems quite obvious that if we are to have a food stamp bill—and I want a food stamp bill—we are going to have to accept some kind of a compromise. This is a compromise between the 3-year and the 1-year versions. I think that a properly administered food stamp program is the best and cheapest program of its kind. For that reason I feel it is desirable that we proceed to accept the Senate amendments at this time.

I felt, and still feel, that a 1-year extension was the better course. This House voted for a 1-year bill. I felt that your conferees were obligated to insist on this provision inasmuch as the House had by separate vote recorded its wish. As a conferee it is my purpose to reflect the expressed will of the House. I think that my colleagues on the conference agreed with this thinking. For this reason we refused to accept an agreement on other terms.

On the other hand, we felt that if this House now wants to reverse its position it has a perfect right to do so. Our action is intended to allow the House to reverse its action if this is its desire. I feel that you have that right. As your agent I did not have it.

The motion I have made gives you the opportunity to decide for yourselves. I believe that is fair to all. I am for the food stamp program, so I shall vote "aye."

Before I complete my statement I want to express my appreciation to my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER]. Although he does not agree with me as to the desirability of the food stamp program, he has cooperated to bring this matter to a vote. Let me also express my appreciation to the lady from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], who has worked so hard for the program. I have disagreed with her methods, but never her motives.

I yield now 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have always opposed the food stamp plan and opposed it here when it passed the House. The House did not agree with me. They passed the bill for a 1-year extension. The Senate passed a 3-year extension.

We have had a meeting of the conferees between the House and the Senate several times. We have not been able to get together. Today we had another meeting, and we agreed to disagree and report back to each house for further instructions. The Senate took the bill back to the Senate and made an amendment to their original bill for 2 years instead of 3 years. In my opinion, the House will probably sustain the 2-year version for the reason that in the first place the Senate met us half way. There is no question of bullheadedness or stubbornness on the part of the Senate. We asked them to accept the 1-year, and we stood pat all this time. The chairman and I stood pat today. As far as I am personally concerned, I do not see anything to be gained by fighting the matter any longer. I do not think the House will turn down a bill if it means either 2 years or no bill.

There is one other fact to take into consideration, and that is the fact that the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, as I understand it, cannot be passed, an act in the amount of $6 billion or $7 billion, until some disposition is made of this food stamp bill.

Mr. Speaker, I always fight the issues involved just as hard as I possibly can. I fought the issue involved in this particular case. However, I got overruled. I feel that the attitude of the House will be to accept this amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

If that is true, that is all right insofar as I personally am concerned. I do not care to carry the fight any further. I know, however, that when it comes to a vote, of course, I shall vote against it.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERLE. Can the gentleman tell me whether we are still supplying food stamps to the hippies in Drop City, Colo.?

Mr. BELCHER. No, I cannot tell the gentleman that. There have been a lot of things in the food stamp plan that I do not personally agree with and of which I do not approve. I do not know whether that has happened or not.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I respond to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE] by saying that the city to which the gentleman refers which is located in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent, I am happy to report that they are not receiving any of these funds for the purchase of food stamps.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. Will the gentleman from Colorado tell me whether or not, or for how long a period of time, the Government has supported a food stamp program for the hippies that have gathered in the State which is represented by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EVANS]?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado in order to respond to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Well, I will respond to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE] by saying, I do not know exactly how much time elapsed, but it was not too long after the discovery was made that they were there and had applied for food stamps and had received food stamps that the decision was made that they do not qualify and thus were denied the benefits of the food stamp program.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. But, for a short period of time they were issued food stamps, although they are no longer qualified to receive them?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERLE. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. SCHERLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Let me see if I have this correct: This is a 2-year program?

Mr. BELCHER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And, what is the cost per year?

Mr. BELCHER. I will ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], to respond to that question.

Mr. POAGE. The authorization now exceeds $200 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $225 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

Mr. GROSS. So, this is something above a $400 million program, or is a program which represents the expenditure of funds amounting to close to one-half billion dollars?

Mr. BELCHER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Am I wrong in my memory that the President of the United States asked the Congress to cut back upon expenditures?

Mr. BELCHER. I do not think the gentleman is wrong in his memory. I see that in the paper quite often.

Mr. GROSS. Well, this scarcely coincides with the President asking the Congress to reduce expenditures; is that not correct?

Mr. BELCHER. No; that is one of the reasons why I voted against it when we had it up here to be passed originally. I went along with a whole lot of other Members. However, I never was sold on the bill to start with, but it passed the House, and under the circumstances which now exist the proper approach is to accept the Senate amendment. I see no other alternative. I would be willing to fight from now on, except for that fact.

Mr. GROSS. Who is it that says that there will be no agricultural appropriation bill passed until and unless this bill is disposed of?

Mr. BELCHER. Well, my understanding is that there is some disposition to accept this compromise because this is contained in the agricultural appropriation bill, and some decision has to be made on it before we take the bill back for final approval.

Mr. GROSS. There would be no harm in taking this money out of the bill, would there?

Mr. BELCHER. Of course, that is what I tried to do from the very beginning on it.

Mr. GROSS. That would be a service to the taxpayers of this country, would it not?

Mr. BELCHER. I think it would. But nevertheless, as I told the gentleman, I fight the issues just as hard as I possibly can. I voted with the gentleman all the way through on that issue. I voted with the gentleman when we had the peanut bill up. The gentleman will recall that. But, nevertheless, there comes a time when it does not necessarily serve a purpose to keep on fighting and losing battles.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad this logjam has been broken finally, and that we are now being given an opportunity in the House to pass in final form a food stamp bill to authorize a continuation for at least 2 years of one of the most successful antipoverty programs of the Federal Government.

Now that the stalemate has been overcome, this is perhaps not the time for complaints about how long the issue has been dragged out. The important thing is that the House conferees, have provided the rest of us with a chance to vote on the bill. So I think the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and his four colleagues who were the House conferees for finding a way to resolve the issue.

The legislation, as it is now before us, would continue the food stamp authorization for 2 years, and set ceilings on appropriations of $200 million for the current fiscal year which began July 1, and $225 million for the 1969 fiscal year. As passed by the Senate, it also requires that the funds be appropriated directly and not come out of section 32 funds. There is no reason why all of us who believe in the food stamp program support the bill in this form.

As the Members know, the administration bill which I introduced called for an open-ended appropriation authority and for indefinite extension of the program. The law we enacted in 1964 was permanent legislation but the appropriation authorization was for only 3 years. The bill we are now considering would extend that authorization for only 2 more years. This is, of course, far better than the legislation which we passed in the House in June, which provided for only a 1-year extension. The Senate had passed a 3-year extension. It has taken since June to get this bill out of conference in one way or another so that both Houses could

compromise on a 2-year bill. It is not the bill I introduced, but I nevertheless am more than willing to support this compromise in order to keep the program alive and to allow it to continue to expand.

Under the bill in its present form, New York City and Boston, and many other areas of the country which do not have the food stamp plan in operation, will be able to apply for certification, so that their low-income families can enjoy a good diet in the American way. The ceiling of $200 million for the current fiscal year should permit expansion of the program from nearly 2 million people to about 2½ million this year, and to more than 3 million next year, when the appropriation ceiling would be $225 million. This certainly does not include all of the poor people in this country who need the help of the food stamp program in order to enjoy an adequate diet. But it is a very respectable expansion of a program which began originally with just a few hundred thousand people 6 years ago.

There is no reason in the world why this legislation has been tied up so long in a fruitless controversy over whether it should be extended for 1 year or 3 years or 2 years. However, as I said, this is not a time for recriminations. I am just glad tht we have gotten it to the point of passage. No one has pointed to any scandals or serious shortcomings in the administration of this program. The most important criticisms have been directed not at the laxity of administration but the severity of the purchase requirements in buying the stamps. Secretary Freeman has reduced the minimum purchase requirement to 50 cents per person in Mississippi, so that should take care of the most serious participation problem we have had under the program. There is room for flexibility in the administration of this program, as I have insisted from the start. It is certainly not perfect.

But as I said, it is undoubtedly the most successful antipoverty program we have had for enabling poor families to eat properly. This is basic. If children are underfed, undernourished, no other program of Government is going to help them to overcome environmental problems. They cannot learn on an empty stomach. Families which cannot eat properly certainly will have very little motivation other than to find a way to overcome hunger. In this rich country with such an abundance of food, we would have a right to feel deep shame if we were unable to feed our own people a decent diet. This legislation solves that problem for us in an intelligent and effective and efficient manner. I urge its passage.

Mr. MOORE. I rise in support of the motion by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] to concur in the Senate amendment to the House bill. I feel this 2-year extension of the food stamp program, under the circumstances, is much needed and desirable. It is far preferable to the original proposal.

I have favored the food stamp program since its inception, and since the first pilot project was inaugurated in McDowell County, W. Va., it has proven beneficial to thousands of individuals in my State. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will cast my vote for this nonpartisan program and would urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment to S. 953.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 154, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

YEAS—196

Albert	Griffiths	Olsen
Anderson, Ill.	Gude	O'Neill, Mass.
Anderson, Tenn.	Halpern	Ottinger
	Hamilton	Patman
Andrews, N. Dak.	Hammer-schmidt	Patten
		Pepper
Annunzio	Hanley	Perkins
Ashley	Hanna	Philbin
Bevill	Hansen, Wash.	Pike
Biester	Hardy	Poage
Bingham	Harsha	Pryor
Blanton	Harvey	Purcell
Boggs	Hathaway	Quie
Boland	Hawkins	Randall
Bolling	Hechler, W. Va.	Rees
Brademas	Heckler, Mass.	Reid, N.Y.
Brasco	Helstoski	Reifel
Brooks	Holifield	Resnick
Brotzman	Horton	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Rhodes, Pa.
Burke, Mass.	Hungate	Riegle
Burton, Calif.	Ichord	Rogers, Colo.
Byrne, Pa.	Irwin	Ronan
Cahill	Jacobs	Rosenthal
Carey	Joelson	Rostenkowski
Carter	Johnson, Calif.	Roush
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Roybal
Cohelan	Jones, Mo.	Ruppe
Conte	Karsten	St Germain
Corbett	Kastenmeier	St. Onge
Corman	Kazen	Saylor
Culver	Kee	Scheuer
Daniels	Kelly	Schweiker
Dawson	Kupferman	Schwengel
de la Garza	Kyl	Shipley
Delaney	Kyros	Sisk
Dent	Landrum	Skubitz
Dingell	Long, Md.	Slack
Donohue	McDade	Smith, Iowa
Dow	McDonald, Mich.	Stafford
		Staggers
Dulski	McFall	Stanton
Duncan	McMillan	Steed
Eckhardt	Macdonald, Mass.	Stratton
Edmondson		Stubblefield
Edwards, La.	Machen	Sullivan
Eilberg	Mahon	Thompson, Ga.
Esch	Mathias, Md.	Tiernan
Evans, Colo.	Matsunaga	Udall
Everett	May	Ullman
Evins, Tenn.	Mayne	Van Deerlin
Farbstein	Meeds	Vanik
Fascell	Mills	Vigorito
Fino	Mink	Waldie
Flood	Monagan	Walker
Foley	Moorhead	Wampler
Ford, William D.	Morgan	Watts
	Morris, N. Mex.	Whalen
Fraser	Morse, Mass.	White
Friedel	Mosher	Whitten
Fulton, Pa.	Moss	Widnall
Fulton, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.	Wright
Gallagher	Natcher	Yates
Gathings	Nedzi	Young
Gibbons	Nix	Zablocki
Gonzalez	O'Hara, Ill.	Zwach
Gray	O'Hara, Mich.	
Green, Oreg.	O'Konski	
Green, Pa.		

NAYS—154

Abbitt	Eshleman	Pettis
Adair	Findley	Pickle
Andrews, Ala.	Fisher	Pirnie
Arends	Flynt	Poff
Ashbrook	Fuqua	Pollock
Ashmore	Galifianakis	Price, Tex.
Ayres	Gardner	Quillen
Baring	Gettys	Reid, Ill.
Bates	Goodell	Reinecke
Battin	Goodling	Rhodes, Ariz.
Belcher	Gross	Rivers
Bell	Grover	Roberts
Bennett	Gurney	Robison
Berry	Hagan	Rogers, Fla.
Betts	Haley	Roth
Bolton	Hall	Roudebush
Bow	Hansen, Idaho	Rumsfeld
Bray	Henderson	Satterfield
Brown, Mich.	Hosmer	Schadeberg
Brown, Ohio	Hutchinson	Scherle
Broyhill, N.C.	Jarman	Schneebeli
Broyhill, Va.	Jonas	Scott
Buchanan	Jones, N.C.	Selden
Burke, Fla.	Keith	Shriver
Burleson	King, N.Y.	Sikes
Burton, Utah	Kornegay	Smith, Calif.
Bush	Laird	Smith, N.Y.
Cabell	Langen	Smith, Okla.
Cederberg	Latta	Snyder
Chamberlain	Lennon	Springer
Clancy	Lipscomb	Steiger, Ariz.
Clausen, Don H.	Lloyd	Stuckey
	Lukens	Taft
Clawson, Del	McClory	Talcott
Cleveland	McClure	Taylor
Collier	McCulloch	Teague, Calif.
Colmer	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Conable	MacGregor	Tuck
Cowger	Mailliard	Vander Jagt
Cramer	Marsh	Waggonner
Cunningham	Mathias, Calif.	Watkins
Curtis	Michel	Watson
Davis, Wis.	Miller, Ohio	Whalley
Dellenback	Minshall	Whitener
Denney	Mize	Wiggins
Derwinski	Montgomery	Williams, Pa.
Devine	Morton	Winn
Dickinson	Myers	Wydler
Dorn	Nelsen	Wylie
Dowdy	Nichols	Wyman
Downing	O'Neal, Ga.	Zion
Edwards, Ala.	Passman	

NOT VOTING—72

Abernethy	Giaimo	Multer
Adams	Gilbert	Murphy, N.Y.
Addabbo	Gubser	Pelly
Aspinall	Halleck	Pool
Barrett	Harrison	Price, Ill.
Blackburn	Hays	Pucinski
Blatnik	Hébert	Railsback
Brinkley	Herlong	Rarick
Brock	Hicks	Rodino
Broomfield	Holland	Rooney, N.Y.
Button	Hull	Rooney, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hunt	Ryan
Casey	Johnson, Pa.	Sandman
Celler	Karth	Steiger, Wis.
Conyers	King, Calif.	Stephens
Daddario	Kirwan	Tenzer
Davis, Ga.	Kleppe	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Kluczynski	Thomson, Wis.
Dole	Kuykendall	Tunney
Dwyer	Leggett	Utt
Edwards, Calif.	Long, La.	Williams, Miss.
Erlenborn	McCarthy	Willis
Fallon	Madden	Wilson, Bob
Feighan	Martin	Wilson, Charles H.
Ford, Gerald R.	Meskill	
Fountain	Miller, Calif.	Wolff
Frelinghuysen	Minish	Wyatt
Garmatz	Moore	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Moore for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against

Mr. Button for, with Mr. Martin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Minish with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Hunt.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Kleppe.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Brinkley.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Karth.

Mr. WAGGONNER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORNELIU MANESCU—CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT OF U.N.?

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great concern continuing reports that the administration is seriously considering supporting Corneliu Manescu, Foreign Minister of Communist Rumania, for the presidency of the United Nations General Assembly next session. The idea that we would give a second thought to such a mockery of freedom appalls me and I urge my colleagues here in the House to voice their protests to the White House.

Communist Rumania openly supports the Vietcong in its war against South Vietnam and supports them with strategic materials that are being used, daily, to slaughter American servicemen. The United States is the subject of repeated, vicious attacks in the state-controlled press of Rumania, and there is no freedom anywhere in the nation. Even the leftist New York Times calls it "the most oppressive regime in Eastern Europe."

Rumania boasts that their cooperation with Russia is the cornerstone of their foreign policy and as long as this is true, it is unthinkable for the United States to support, directly, indirectly or by passively taking no position, any Rumanian Communist for the presidency of the General Assembly.

I make no bones about my position concerning the United Nations. For 10 years I have advocated that we withdraw from it and form in its place an international council of free nations.

Had we taken steps to create such an organization to take the place of the U.N. when I first proposed it, we would have today an effective worldwide body of nations dedicated to peace, working constructively for peace. Instead we are stuck with the same old discredited, Communist-dominated, U.S.-financed gabfest.

After the debacle of the Middle East crisis this summer there should not be any reasonable men left who has confidence in the U.N.'s ability to mediate disputes or maintain peace. Certainly any desire to promote peace will in no way be advanced by having a Communist from an Iron Curtain country as the President of the General Assembly. The only time the U.N. takes any active part in any dispute is when there is a desire to do so on the part of the leadership. Thus, no action is taken against Communist Cuba, yet sanctions are enforced against Rhodesia; a classic case of activity resulting from selfish interest rather than principle. With a Communist sympathizer as its head and a Communist as President of the General Assembly, there will be absolutely no inclination in the U.N. to pursue democratic principles in the future.

Not only should this administration announce without equivocation that it does not support Rumania's Foreign Minister, but it should announce that it will exert every ounce of its fading prestige to see that he is not elected.

The U.N. has been brought to the edge of nothingness by the direction of the profoundly anti-American U Thant. With a fellow Red in the presidency of the General Assembly, the entire concept of a body of "peace-loving nations" becomes sheer foolishness. Every voice of protest against Manescu is a drop of water on the stony heads of the State Department and I plead with my fellow Members to raise their voices before it is too late.

BILL TO INCREASE NUMBER OF SUPREME COURT MEMBERS

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill that would augment the Supreme Court by permitting an increase in its number from nine to 15. This would aid it in disposing of the constantly increasing volume of its workload and grant the Chief Executive an opportunity to add to the Court members aware of not only what the law should be, but also aware of what the law is.

The need for this bill is, I think, illustrated daily and as one example, I include a letter of a present member of the Court to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor and published therein, September 14, 1967:

SPECIAL TRUST

TO THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

In a recent Monitor you carried an article by your distinguished Erwin D. Canham, called, "The right of dissent." In that article he says, "There are laws against treason, in peacetime as well as in war. When does dissent become treason?"

The Constitution defines "treason" as follows: "Art. 3, Sec. 3. Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort."

This comes into play when there is "war" and "war" comes into being by a "declaration" by Congress, as provided in Article I, Sec. 8. The difference between "war" and a state of hostilities is tremendous—as constitutional students know.

So it is a form of illiteracy to talk about "treason" and "war" in the constitutional sense when speaking of those who voice their dissent against our Vietnam policies.

Sedition, of course, is quite a different thing. Whether speech alone could ever qualify is a much mooted question. It was so condemned in one case where "war" had been declared and was in process.

It was condemned in another case where there was a "conspiracy" to teach the noxious creed even though there was no "war" in existence.

But there were qualifications originally stated by Mr. Justice Holmes in the "clear and present danger" test.

The terms "treason" and "war" as used in the Constitution are words of art. The truck drivers and field hands of the nation cannot be expected to undstand subtle constitutional nuances.

But news editors who mold public opinion have a special trust, a special responsibility.

Justice WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS,
Supreme Court of the United States.

WASHINGTON.

[It is with utmost temerity that a mere newspaperman should disagree with a Supreme Court Justice. Frankly, though, I do not see the basis of Mr. Justice Douglas' statement that Sec. 3 of Art. III only comes into play "when there is war." The section says that treason consists not only "in levying War against them," but "in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort." It seems to me giving aid and comfort to enemies can happen in these days when a declaration of war is somewhat unlikely under certain conditions. At least one federal district court has stated that, "In times of peace it is treason for one of our citizens to incite war against us." U.S. v. Stephan, 50 F. Supp. 738 at 741–42 (1943) E. D. C.]

Some refer to this bill as a "Court packing" proposal. From this letter you can see that it is not. The Court is packed already.

THE VICTORY OF THE "INTREPID"

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us in the Congress and throughout America would wish to salute with deep pride *Intrepid's* overwhelming victory and successful defense of the 20th challenge for the America's Cup. *Intrepid,* skippered with consummate skill and seamanship by Bus Mosbacher of White Plains, N.Y., was sailed by a topflight, talented, and hardworking crew. *Intrepid* led not alone in each of the four races but also ran ahead on each leg of all the races.

Intrepid's victory is, I think, a tribute to many in the United States who shared in this endeavor, including Olin Stephens, the understated and gifted designer of the Cup defender; Bus Mosbacher, the successful skipper now for a second

time; and the very fine crew, composed of Ned Hall, Jory Hinman, Toby Tobin, Billy Kelly, Bob Connell, Bizzy Monte-Sano, Buddy Bombard, David Elwell, Sam Wakeman, Bill Strawbridge, and Vic Romagna.

While our most hearty "well done" goes to the *Intrepid,* in her victory we also salute the three other fine boats who participated in the America's Cup trials and, in the words of Yachting magazine, "devoted their summer, and more, to the quest for the America's Cup." The *Constellation,* the 1964 Cup winner, was skippered by Bob McCullough, and her crew included John Browning, Norris Strawbridge, Rich DuMoulin, Tom Young, Dick Strawbridge, Westy Saltonstall, George O'Day, David Rockefeller, Jerry Silverman, and Putter Brown. The skipper of *American Eagle* was George Hinman and his crew consisted of Tony Parker, John Dickerson IV, Steve Colgate, John and Tony Termaine, Clayton Ewing, Irving Pratt, John Nichols, Konrad Ulbrich, and John Kelly. Briggs Cunningham skippered *Columbia* and his crew was Tom Schock, Burke Sawyer, Fred MacDonald, Don Vaughn, Rob Dougan, Kent Edler, John Creed, James Jones, Pat Dougan, and Bill Ficker.

Equally, I think, we should pay tribute to *Dame Pattie,* the spirit of Australia, and to Jock Sturrock, her skipper, for the national effort and sportsmanship shown throughout the race. Her fine crew included Pod O'Donnell, John Taylor, Tony Ellis, Michael Greenaway, Andrew White, Sandy Schofield, Richard Dickson, Norm Booth, Bill Barnett, Norm Wright, Bob Thornton, and Ed Beacham.

Intrepid's victory marked the 20th unsuccessful attempt to wrest the America's Cup away from the United States since 1851, when the trophy was first established after the schooner *America* beat Britain's best yacht to win the Royal Yacht Squadron 100-guinea cup.

It is a measure of the international spirit that characterizes these races over more than a century that Australia has given so freely and so painstakingly of her time and effort to make the series worthwhile, and we would certainly hope that there will be another race in this fine tradition in which Australia will again participate.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a history of the America's Cup race that appeared in the September 1967 issue of Yachting and the front-page story from today's New York Times giving an account of the final and winning race, which decided the series 4 to 0.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I join the gentleman in complimenting the victorious vessel and crew and our very fine neighbors across the Pacific but I also suggest that while we are speaking on the subject of yachting, we stay off the subject of tennis while talking about sports in recent times.

Mr. REID of New York. I think the Australians deserve great credit for their attainment in tennis. I am glad that we can return the compliment in yachting.

The articles mentioned above follow:

[From Yachting, September 1967]

THE CUP CHRONOLOGY—A DIGEST OF THE COMPETITION SINCE 1851

(By Alfred F. Loomis)

Of all the races that have been run since seafarers started sailing for the fun of it none has had so profound an effect as that of August 22, 1851, when the 102-foot schooner *America* raced around England's Isle of Wight and won the Royal Yacht Squadron's 100-gulnea cup. The prize for defeating Britain's best In thls 53-mile event was valuable in itself. After it had been presented to the New York YC by the syndicate which owned *America,* renamed The America's Cup and placed in International competition, it became invaluable. Nlneteen attempts have been made to remove it from the custody of Americans and in the process all the concomitants of sailboat racing from yacht design to helmsmanship and crew technique have developed and improved.

The first defense of the Cup occurred when James Ashbury's 108′ schooner *Cambria,* bearer of a challenge from the Royal Thames YC, arrived in our waters after having narrowly defeated James Gordon Bennett's schooner *Dauntless* in a race from Daunt Rock, Ireland, to Sandy Hook, New York. We raced a fleet of 23 sloops and schooners against the lone Britisher around a Sandy Hook course, and it was not altogether surprising that *Cambria* finished after seven American yachts had crossed the line or that she dropped to 10th place on corrected time and lost to Franklin Osgood's schooner *Magic* by a margin of 39 minutes and 12 seconds.

But Ashbury seemed to be a good sort and the following year came back with the 126′ schooner *Livonia* and a challenge from the Royal Harwich YC. We agree to race only one boat against the challenger and to make it a series of the best four out of seven races. But we fudged a bit by lining up four defenders from which to choose, our choice to be determined by the state of the weather on any given day. As it happened we used only two of the four—the light-weather schooner *Columbia* and the heavy-weather schooner *Sappho. Columbia* won the first two and might have taken the third had it not come on to blow. On the beat out to the lightship she parted her flying jib stay, losing a few precious minutes, and on the run home broke her steering gear. *Livonia* won by a comfortable 15-minute margin. The score then being two to one, we sailed *Sappho* In the fourth race in which a slack air at the start hardened into a reefing breeze, and we beat *Livonia* by more than half an hour. *Sappho's* margin for the fifth race was nearly half an hour.

Canada had a try at the Cup in the centennial year of our independence. Toronto's Royal Canadian YC challenged with the syndicate-owned schooner *Countee of Dufferin,* which lost two races to John S. Dickerson's schooner *Madeleine.* The venerable *America,* then owned by General Benjamin F. Butler, accompanied the two centerboarders around the course, keeping out of the way, and was sprightly enough to beat *Countess* by 20 minutes, which was only seven minutes less than *Madeleine's* winning margin.

The Bay of Quinte YC of Lake Ontario challenged five years later with the 70′ cb. sloop *Atalanta* and we defended with the 67′ sloop *Mischief,* affectionately known as the "Iron Pot." After having won two races by 28 and 39 minutes, we Americans realized that *Atalanta* was a dangerous skimming dish whose draft was identical with that of *Mischiefs.* Should a future, faster centerboarder be towed to New York, as *Atalanta* was, via the Erie Canal, there was no telling what might happen to the America's Cup. The deed of gift was changed so that only a club having an ocean water regatta course could challenge and so the challenger must arrive for the match under sail on her own bottom.

For the first time the Royal Yacht Squadron entered the lists and for good measure challenged with Sir Richard Sutton's cutter *Genesta* and with Lt. William Henn's cutter *Galatea.* The former was met by the cb. sloop *Puritan,* designed by Edward Burgess and owned by a Boston syndicate headed by General Charles J. Paine. *Puritan* won two races and retained the Cup, though the contenders came four times to the starting line. On the first day there was too little air. On the second *Puritan* fouled *Genesta* and the committee awarded the race to *Genesta* if she sailed around the course. Sir Richard courteously rejected the offer, saying that he had come for a race and not a sailover. On the third try, which *Puritan* won by more than 16 minutes, there was spectator interference. But the British sportsman remained good tempered, and at the conclusion, when *Genesta* lost by only 1 minute 28 seconds, she hailed the winner with three rousing cheers.

Postponed a year, the challenge of Lt. Henn and his cutter *Galatea* was tendered not by the Yacht Squadron but by the Scottish Royal Northern YC. General Paine commissioned Burgess to design a new centerboarder for his own account. The design of this beamy, powerful centerboard sloop was so different from that of the extreme "plank-on-edge" challenger that the series became known as the battle of the types. *Mayflower* won two races with margins of 11 and 29 minutes.

The Royal Clyde YC of Scotland now challenged on behalf of James Bell with the cutter *Thistle* from the designing board of George L. Watson, whose later *Britannia* became the most famous of all British racing yachts. Built behind closed doors, *Thistle* proved inferior to the third Palne-Burgess defender. The match, won easily by *Volunteer* in two straight races, was attended by mutual distrust and acrimony.

There was worse to come. Changes in the deed of gift required, among others things, a future challenger's waterline length and beam, extreme beam and draft to be made known 10 months in advance. The British, as represented again by the Royal Yacht Squadron, charged in 1889 that such information would permit us to outbuild any yacht that they designed, and broke off negotiations for a challenge on behalf of the Earl of Dunraven. It was not until 1893 when we demanded only the length of a prospective challenger that dickering was resumed, and Lord Dunraven re-entered the fray with *Valkyrie II,* a new 92′ sloop of Watson's design. In the meantime Edward Burgess had died and Nathanael G. Herreshoff had entered upon a career that continued with success after success for an entire generation. His 124′ bronze sloop *Vigilant* owned by a New York syndicate headed by C. Oliver Iselin, defeated *Valkyrie II* in three straight races.

Next came *Valkyrie III* and a whole packet of disagreeable contention. Lord Dunraven unjustly charged after losing the first of three races that the waterline length of our *Defender* (for such was the name of the new Herreshoff creation) had been illegally increased by the addition of ballast. After loss of the second race Dunraven accused *Defender* of having fouled *Valkyrie* at the start, although photographs subsequently revealed that *Valkyrie* had in fact fouled *Defender.* The irascible Earl withdrew after the start of the third race, charging that spectator crowding made it impossible for him to sail without danger. By such tactics the challenger virtually forced the New York YC into the dual role of judge and executioner and Dunraven was "tried" by the club, deemed guilty of conduct unbecoming to a gentleman and a lord, and was expelled from honorary membership.

Public Law 90-91
90th Congress, S. 953
September 27, 1967

An Act

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

81 STAT. 228

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1967;" the following: "not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;". Food Stamp Act of 1964, amendment. 78 Stat. 709. 7 USC 2025.

SEC. 2. Section 16(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose and in no event shall it be carried out with funds derived from permanent appropriations." Limitation.

Approved September 27, 1967.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 189 accompanying H. R. 1318 (Comm. on Agriculture and No. 649 (Comm. of Conference).
SENATE REPORT No. 289 (Comm. on Agriculture).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 113 (1967):
May 31, Sept. 19: Considered and passed Senate.
May 15, June 8, and Sept. 19: Considered and passed House in lieu of H. R. 1318.

GPO 85-139

8th Cavalry in the Republic of Vietnam, when his platoon, while advancing tactically, suddenly came under intense fire from the enemy located on a ridge immediately to the front. Six members of the platoon were killed instantly and a number were wounded, including the platoon leader. Specialist Dolby's every move brought fire from the enemy. However, aware that the platoon leader was critically wounded, and that the platoon was in a precarious situation, Specialist Dolby moved the wounded men to safety and deployed the remainder of the platoon to engage the enemy. Subsequently, his dying platoon leader ordered Specialist Dolby to withdraw the forward elements to rejoin the platoon. Despite the continuing intense enemy fire and with utter disregard for his own safety, Specialist Dolby positioned able-bodied men to cover the withdrawal of the forward elements, assisted the wounded to the new position, and he, alone, attacked enemy positions until his ammunition was expended. Replenishing his ammunition, he returned to the area of most intense action, single-handedly killed three enemy machine gunners and neutralized the enemy fire, thus enabling friendly elements on the flank to advance on the enemy redoubt. He defied the enemy fire to personally carry a seriously wounded soldier to safety, where he could be treated and, returning to the forward area, he crawled through withering fire to within fifty meters of the enemy bunkers and threw smoke grenades to mark them for air strikes. Although repeatedly under fire at close range from enemy snipers and automatic weapons, Specialist Dolby directed artillery fire on the enemy and succeeded in silencing several enemy weapons. He remained in his exposed location until his comrades had displaced to more secure positions. His actions of unsurpassed valor during four hours of intense combat were a source of inspiration to his entire company, contributed significantly to the success of the overall assault on the enemy position, and were directly responsible for saving the lives of a number of his fellow soldiers. Specialist Dolby's heroism was in the highest tradition of the United States Army.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Food Stamp Act Extension

The President's Remarks Upon Signing Bill To Extend the Food Stamp Act of 1964. September 27, 1967

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, Senator Aiken, Senator Byrd, Senator Ellender, Senator Boggs, Chairman Poage, Congresswoman Sullivan, Congressman Purcell, and the other Members of the House and Senate who I did not get recorded here:

I welcome one and all of you for the good work that you have done. I think we all share the common view that we want no American in this country to ever go hungry. We believe that we have the knowledge, the compassion, and the resources to banish hunger and to do away with malnutrition, if we will only apply those resources and those energies.

The bill that I have asked you to be here with me when I sign puts some of that abundance into the reach of the people of America.

Under the food stamp program a low-income family can take what little money it has for food and purchase food stamps. At the neighborhood grocery store these are worth more than they cost. The difference is made up by the Federal Government.

Food stamps are not the only weapon in the assault on hunger. The Food Stamp Act was passed 3 years ago. In that time, the program has expanded from 43 pilot areas in 22 States to 838 areas in 41 States. Today it is helping to feed nearly 2 million needy Americans. This extension will enable us to do still more.

We have nearly 20 million schoolchildren—more than ever before—receiving low cost or free meals under the school lunch program. That program today is in its 21st year.

More than 100,000 children have a better chance to learn because they began their day with a decent breakfast because of the Child Nutrition Act that we passed in 1966.

Three million needy Americans in family units are receiving better diets in the commodity donation program of the Department of Agriculture.

As I sign this act, I am asking the Secretary to help America's 300 poorest counties which do not now have food assistance to start a community distribution program to be available for the low-income families.

We are all mindful that the poor need more than food. The causes of poverty are complex. The answers to poverty are very difficult. The escape from poverty is not going to come soon, but we must all continue to try the best way that we can to give all that we can to banish poverty from our land.

Poverty's cruelest wound is hunger. The act that we will sign today, I think, will do some little something to relieve some of that hunger.

To those men and women in the House and Senate who have had the vision to help us prepare this bill by the long drawn out hearings and the days in conference, and the debates on the floor, we owe them all a debt of gratitude which I want to acknowledge on behalf of the American people.

This will help our poor. This will help our farmers. And even though this is a bipartisan group, I hope it will help our Congress.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:58 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. As enacted, the bill (S. 953) is Public Law 90-91.

United States Ambassador to Jamaica

Announcement of Intention To Nominate Walter N. Tobriner of the District of Columbia. September 27, 1967

President Johnson today announced his intention to nominate Walter N. Tobriner of the District of Columbia to be United States Ambassador to Jamaica. He will succeed Wilson T. M. Beale, Jr., who is returning to Washington to retire after 31 years of service.

Since 1961, Mr. Tobriner has been President of the District of Columbia's Board of Commissioners.

Born in Washington, D.C., on July 2, 1902, Mr. Tobriner received the degree of bachelor of arts from Princeton University in 1923, where he was a member of Phi Beta Kappa. He subsequently received a bachelor of laws degree from Harvard University in 1926, and was admitted to the District of Columbia Bar in 1927. Mr. Tobriner served in the U.S. Army Air Force from 1943 to 1946, rising to the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Since 1927, Mr. Tobriner has practiced law in Washington. From 1933 to 1950, he was a professor of law at the National University Law School. He was a member of the Washington Board of Education from 1952 to 1961, and served as the board's president from 1957 to 1961. Mr. Tobriner has also served as president of the Garfield Memorial Hospital, director of the Washington Blue Cross Plan, and as president of the Washington Hospital Center. He has been president of the Lisner Home since 1954.

In 1958, Mr. Tobriner served as chairman of the United Nations Day in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Tobriner, his wife, Marienne E. Smith Tobriner, and their son and daughter reside in Washington, D.C.

Leif Erikson Day, 1967

Proclamation 3808. September 27, 1967

By the President of the United States of America a Proclamation

Nearly ten centuries ago, Leif Erikson sailed across uncharted Northern seas, a captain in one of history's greatest periods of exploration. Earlier, Norsemen had discovered and settled Iceland and Greenland, where stone houses and churches still bear witnesses to their presence.

The courage and determination of these intrepid seamen have inspired hundreds of thousands of Americans who trace their ancestry back to the Vikings. These qualities have long been a part of the American character, and have preserved and defended our Nation since its inception.

It is appropriate that we give national recognition to Leif Erikson today, when men of similar courage and imagination are confronting equally formidable challenges in the heavens and under the seas.

I am honored to comply with the request of the Congress of the United States, in a joint resolution approved September 2, 1964 (78 Stat. 849), that the President proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Monday, October 9, 1967, as Leif Erikson Day; and I direct the appropriate Government officials to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day.

I also invite the people of the United States to honor the memory of Leif Erikson on that day by holding appropriate exercises and ceremonies in schools and churches, or other suitable places.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-seventh day of September, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-second.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10 a.m., September 28, 1967]

National Farm-City Week, 1967

Proclamation 3809. September 28, 1967

By the President of the United States of America a Proclamation

In less than a generation, the American farmer has created a greater agricultural abundance than his predecessors through all the generations of our history achieved.

One farmer today feeds and clothes himself and 39 others—almost four times as many as he sustained a quarter of a century ago.

This revolution wrought by the American farmer is one of the triumphs of our age. Even though he himself has not always received his fair share of the Nation's prosperity—a circumstance which his country in good conscience cannot permit to continue—he has helped to improve the conditions of life for every American.

The average consumer today enjoys a more abundant supply of food than any people has ever known—and he pays a lesser share of his income for it than ever before.

One of the most vital contributions to the achievements of American agriculture has been understanding and cooperation between farm and city—an interdependence that has supported our National development.

Moreover, American agriculture now represents hope for cities and villages far beyond our shores, where the spectre of poverty threatens the stability—and even the peace—of the world.